R E P O R T   R E S U M E S

ED 011 531 UD 001 855

REPORT ON EDUCATION TO THE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON THE LOS ANGELES RIOTS.

BY- MARTYN, KENNETH A.

PUB DATE NOV 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$5.84 146P.

DESCRIPTORS- *COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, *DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS, *CULTURALLY ADVANTAGED, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, *PUBLIC SCHOOLS, SCHOOL MAINTENANCE, PARENT ATTITUDES, TEACHER ATTITUDES, TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS, TEACHER EXPERIENCE, PERFORMANCE, INTELLIGENCE TESTS, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, SPECIAL SERVICES, LUNCH PROGRAMS, ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDES, HIGH SCHOOLS, ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, SCHOOL LIBRARIES, CLASSROOMS, EXPENDITURES, COUNSELING SERVICES, WATTS, LOS ANGELES

THE SCHOOLS IN DISADVANTAGED AND NONDISADVANTAGED AREAS OF LOS ANGELES WERE COMPARED IN THIS EXTENSIVE STUDY IN TERMS OF THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE STUDENTS, THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SCHOOLS, AND PARENT AND TEACHER ATTITUDES. THE DATA, GATHERED THROUGH QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEWS, ARE SUMMARIZED IN 71 TABLES. THE MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY ARE THAT (1) THE STUDENTS IN THE DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS HAD LOWER IQ AND ACHIEVEMENT SCORES AND LOWER RATES OF PERFORMANCE, (2) ALTHOUGH CLASS SIZE WAS SMALLER IN DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS, THE BETTER-PREPARED TEACHERS TAUGHT IN THE OTHER SCHOOLS, WHICH ALSO HAD THE GREATER PROPORTION OF PERMANENT TEACHERS. THE PERCENTAGE OF SUBSTITUTES WAS GREATEST IN WATTS, THE SCENE OF RIOTS IN 1965. SCHOOLS IN BOTH AREAS HAD BEEN TREATED EQUALLY IN BUILDING MAINTENANCE AND IN AVAILABILITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL, AND ALTHOUGH MORE SPECIAL SCHOOL SERVICES WERE AVAILABLE IN DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS, ALL OF THE SCHOOLS WITHOUT OPERATING CAFETERIAS WERE LOCATED IN DISADVANTAGED AREAS, AND (3) A HIGHER PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS IN DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS WERE EAGER TO CHANGE THEIR ASSIGNMENTS, FELT THEIR STUDENTS TO BE UNMOTIVATED, RATED PARENTS AS UNINVOLVED, AND FELT THAT THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION WAS UNINTERESTED. SOME RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE EDUCATION OF THE DISADVANTAGED ARE GIVEN, AND 67 PAGES OF APPENDIXES ARE INCLUDED. (DD)

ED011531

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

REPORT ON EDUCATION
TO THE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON THE LOS ANGELES RIOTS

November 1965

UD 001 855

Submitted by:
Kenneth A. Martyn
Professor of Special Education
California State College at Los Angeles

PREFACE

Only the full cooperation of the Los Angeles City School System has made this urgent study possible. The credit for gathering the data provided by the Los Angeles City Schools belongs not only to the School Board and the Superintendent, but also to many competent administrators within the System, particularly Sam Hamerman, Director of the Office of Urban Affairs.

Administrators from other school districts have also contributed effectively to this study. These include: Keith Martin, Enterprise City School District; Lloyd D. Dickey, Willowbrook School District; Leonard C. Erickson, Compton City Schools; Rae Cargille, Compton Union High School District; Curt Davis and Bernard Watson, San Jose City Schools; Jacob Landers, New York City Schools; Carl Marburger, Detroit City Schools; C. C. Carpenter, Los Angeles County Schools.

A number of organizations and community leaders aided in reviewing the outline for the study and making suggestions for the inquiry. These include: David Carlisle, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Joseph Brooks, Los Angeles Teachers Association; Harry Zivetz, American Federation of Teachers; Congressman Hawkins through his administrative assistant, Willis Williams.

Assemblyman Mervyn Dymally was particularly helpful not only in supplying the summary of the hearings held by his Industrial Relations Committee of the California State Assembly but also in personally reviewing the outline of the study, making suggestions for additional avenues of inquiry, and supplying names for direct contact with teachers in disadvantaged areas of other cities. Mike Manley, Consultant to the California State Assembly Committee on Education, added to the effectiveness of the recommendations in several respects. He gave us advice on recent legislation and described actions currently being considered by the Assembly Education Committee. Professors Harold Bienvenu and Albert Wise also contributed to this study.

Finally, the 4,337 teachers and administrators who aided in this study through information supplied on the questionnaires or through interviews should be recognized. Their contribution of time and thought influenced greatly the direction of the last part of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE ii

LIST OF TABLES v

INTRODUCTION 1

SECTION I

LEVEL OF SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS

Use of Achievement and Intelligence Tests 2

Achievement and Intelligence Test Scores 3

SECTION II

CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOLS IN THE ADVANTAGED AND DISADVANTAGED AREAS

Class Size 6

Teacher Personnel 9

  Employment Status of Teachers
  Education of Teachers
  Experience of Teachers
  Supervisory Ratings of Teachers

Condition of Buildings and Physical Plant 17

  Portable Classrooms
  Double Sessions
  Transportation Schedule
  Cafeteria

Instructional Equipment and Materials 21

  Library
  Audio Visual
  Texts
  Supplies for Instruction

Page

General Financial Support 24

New Curriculum Developments 24

Availability of Special Services 28

Adult School Program 29

SECTION III

HOW TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SOME PARENTS VIEW THE SCHOOLS

Teachers' and Administrators' View of the Schools 31

Attitude toward School Assignment
Attitude toward Students
Rating of the Physical Condition of the School Building
Attitude toward Parents
Rating of School Administrators and Teachers
Attitude toward Central Administration
Administrators' View of the Budget
Recommendations from Teachers and Administrators

Parents' View of the Schools 52

Summary of Questionnaires 58

SECTION IV

NEW OPPORTUNITIES, PROVISIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

New Opportunities and Provisions for Improvement in the Education of Disadvantaged Youth 59

Los Angeles
Other Studies and Other Cities

Recommendations for Improvement in the Education of Disadvantaged Youth 63

How Can This Problem Be Attacked?
What Can Be Done for Students beyond the Early Elementary Years?

APPENDIX A1

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page
1. Grade Five Intelligence and Achievement Data from Schools in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 3
2. Grade Eight Intelligence and Achievement Data from Schools in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 4
3. Grade Eleven Intelligence and Achievement Data from Schools in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 4
4. Elementary Class Size--Ratio of Pupil Personnel to Certificated Personnel 6
5. Elementary Class Size--Ratio of Pupils to Classroom Teachers . 7
6. Average Number of Pupils per Classroom 8
7. Percentage of Elementary Teachers in Each Type of Employment Status for the Five Comparison Districts of Los Angeles . . 10
8. Percentage of Secondary Teachers in Each Type of Employment Status for the Five Comparison Districts of Los Angeles . . 11
9. Highest Degree Earned by Percentage of Elementary Teachers in Each of the Five Comparison Districts of Los Angeles . . 12
10. Highest Degree Earned by Percentage of Secondary Teachers in Each of the Five Comparison Districts of Los Angeles . . 12
11. Average of Total Years of Experience for Elementary and Secondary Teachers for the Five Comparison Districts of Los Angeles 13
12. Average Years of Experience in Present Assignment for the Five Comparison Districts of Los Angeles 13
13. Average Years of Experience within Los Angeles City Schools for the Five Comparison Districts of Los Angeles 14
14. Increase in Pupil Enrollment from 1960 to 1965 in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 15

Table Page

15. Performance Reports for Non-Permanent Secondary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 15

16. Performance Reports for Non-Permanent Elementary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 16

17. Percentage of Teachers in Each Performance Category in Combined Advantaged and Disadvantaged Areas 17

18. Average Annual Expenditure per Average Daily Attendance for Maintenance in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 18

19. Ratio of Permanent to Portable Classrooms in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 19

20. Number of Double Session Elementary Classes in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 19

21. Number of Pupils on Double Sessions in 1955 and 1965 in Comparison Areas and Advantaged Growth Area of Los Angeles . 20

22. Number of Schools without Operating Cafeterias (as of 1955-65) in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 21

23. Expenditure of Textbook Funds in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 23

24. Los Angeles Unified School District Average Expenses of Instructional Supplies per Unit of Average Daily Attendance for Five-Year Period 1959-60 through 1963-64 24

25. Los Angeles Unified School District Average Expenses of Instruction per Unit of Average Daily Attendance for Five-Year Period 1959-60 through 1963-64 25

26. Summary of Participation by Teachers and Administrators from Elementary Schools in Academic Subject Curriculum Committees 26

27. Representation on Citywide Curriculum Committees of Junior High Teachers from Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 1964-65 . 27

28. Representation on Citywide Curriculum Committees of Senior High Teachers from Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 1964-65 . 27

29. Ratio of Elementary Counselors to Pupils, September 1965 . . . 28

30. Ratio of Secondary Counselors to Pupils, 1964-65 29

31. Analysis of Comparison Area Adult Schools in Los Angeles 1964-1965 30

Table Page

32. Analysis of Comparison Area Adult Schools in Los Angeles 1965-1966 as Financed by District Funds 30

33. Attitude toward School Assignment by Elementary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 33

34. Attitude toward School Assignment by Secondary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 33

35. Attitude toward School Assignment by Special Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 34

36. Attitude toward School Assignment by Administrators in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 34

37. Attitude toward Students as Rated by Elementary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 35

38. Attitude toward Students as Rated by Secondary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 35

39. Attitude toward Students as Rated by Special Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 36

40. Attitude toward Students as Rated by Administrators in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 36

41. Attitude toward Physical Condition of School Buildings as Rated by Elementary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 37

42. Attitude toward Physical Condition of School Buildings as Rated by Secondary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 38

43. Attitude toward Physical Condition of School Buildings as Rated by Special Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 38

44. Attitude toward Physical Condition of School Buildings as Rated by Administrators in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles . 39

45. Attitude toward Parents as Rated by Elementary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 40

46. Attitude toward Parents as Rated by Secondary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 40

47. Attitude toward Parents as Rated by Special Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 41

Table Page

48. Attitude toward Parents as Rated by Administrators in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 41

49. Rating of School Administrators by Elementary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 42

50. Rating of School Administrators by Secondary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 43

51. Rating of School Administrators by Special Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 43

52. Rating of Teachers by Administrators in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 44

53. Interest of Central Administration as Viewed by Elementary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 45

54. Interest of Central Administration as Viewed by Secondary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 45

55. Interest of Central Administration as Viewed by Special Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 46

56. Interest of Central Administration as Viewed by Building Administrators in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 46

57. Attitude toward Budget as Rated by Administrators in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 47

58. Recommendations from Elementary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 48

59. Recommendations from Secondary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 49

60. Recommendations from Special Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 50

61. Recommendations from Administrators in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 51

62. Family Position of Respondent to Parent Interview-Questionnaire 52

63. Number of Years Children Have Been in Present School 53

64. Number of Other Schools Children Have Attended 53

65. Visits by Parents to Schools Children Are Attending 54

Table Page

66. Attitude of Parents toward Treatment of Child in School . . . 54

67. Attitude of Parents toward Reading Program in School 55

68. Parents' Evaluation of the Schools 56

69. Parents' Evaluation of the Teachers 56

70. Parents' Participation in PTA 57

71. Parents' Attitude toward PTA 57

INTRODUCTION

The three major purposes of this study were: (1) to ascertain the level of school achievement of children in the disadvantaged areas, (2) to determine the extent to which the schools, despite de facto segregation, had created equal opportunity to learn for children in culturally disadvantaged areas, and (3) to decide what most needs to be done for improvement in the level of education of those who reside in the culturally disadvantaged areas.

The first question cannot be answered in the abstract. The answer must be based on comparative data. Thus, this study reports the characteristics of the school program not only in the Watts and Avalon Districts (Negro-American), but also in the East District (Mexican-American), West Los Angeles (economically advantaged), and other districts in the County of Los Angeles. Comparison has been obtained from Watts and Avalon, Boyle Heights and East Los Angeles [illegible] Pacific Palisades.) The [illegible] and boundaries for these districts are those established by the Welfare Planning Council.

As much data as was available has been obtained from other school districts in Los Angeles County in adjoining areas. These districts include Enterprise City School District, Willowbrook School District, Compton City Schools, and Compton Union High School District. Relevant information was also obtained from San Jose City Schools, Detroit City Schools, and New York City Schools. It is on this comparative base that answers to the primary questions rest.

This study was organized in four major sections: (1) What is the level of school achievement of children in the disadvantaged areas? (2) What are the characteristics of the public schools in the disadvantaged areas in comparison to schools in the more advantaged sections? (3) How do teachers, administrators, and parents in the disadvantaged areas view the schools? (4) What consideration has been given to the various new opportunities, recommendations, and provisions for improvement in the education of disadvantaged youth?

SECTION I

LEVEL OF SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS

Use of Achievement and Intelligence Tests

The most efficient method for determining school achievement level of large numbers of children in the public schools is by use of standardized achievement tests. Typically the standardized achievement test provides an opportunity to sample the student's knowledge of school subjects, such as reading, writing, arithmetic. The student's performance is compared by the use of prepared tables to the performance of other students of his age and grade level. Generally the comparative basis, or norm tables, are made up of scores [illegible] by other students of similar age and grade placement throughout the country.

Another device frequently used by school districts to ascertain the appropriate level of school achievement is the intelligence or scholastic aptitude test. Contrary to some popular thought, these tests do not purport to measure biological capacity for intellectual endeavor. They compare, instead, what the student has learned from his environment in comparison with what other students have learned from their environment. On the basis of this learning, the test score is developed into an index, frequently in the form of an IQ score. This index is intended as a predictor of probable success in further school work. This prediction for the tests is based on the assumption that the environment from which the learning was made is approximately the same for the student taking the test and the students whose scores formed the norming tables.

Considerable controversy has broken out from time to time about the appropriateness of the use of intelligence tests, particularly for culturally disadvantaged youth. On the one hand, it is argued that they do predict the student's likely academic success better than any other device and are therefore a useful tool to the schools. On the other hand, it is argued that they reflect not the student's intelligence but the lack, particularly at an early age, of an environment conducive to the development of those abilities, particularly verbal, that contribute so much to school success. Both arguments are valid. The intelligence tests should not be used as [illegible] so that [illegible] start the first year of school with a more nearly equal opportunity to learn.

Achievement and Intelligence Test Scores

Data was requested from each of the geographic comparison areas on the latest available series of achievement and intelligence test scores. It was decided that grades 5, 8, and 11 which had been used for the statewide testing program would be appropriate. Dr. Howard Bowman of the Los Angeles City Schools provided the data for each of the geographic areas within Los Angeles. Because of the split term (A and B grade levels) within Los Angeles, a decision had to be made as to which series of tests to use. The fall semester (B grade level) was used because it covered a larger percentage of all fifth, eighth and eleventh graders (approximately 70%). Also, this timing corresponds more closely for a comparison with U. S. school systems which are on an annual rather than a semi-annual promotion system.

Normally the school district interprets the data for large groups in terms of medians. However, because we wanted data from geographic groups from within the City, it was necessary to revert to the use of mean test scores. Dr. Bowman has indicated, however, that differences between mean and median scores in distributions of the [illegible] of scores involved [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] from Dr. Bowman [illegible] is included in the Appendix [illegible]. Tables 1, 2, and 3 summarize the intelligence and achievement test data for the five areas within Los Angeles City.

Table 1

Grade Five Intelligence and Achievement Data from Schools in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

Group	I. Q.	Reading Vocab.	Reading Comp.	Arithmetic Reas.	Arithmetic Fund.	Mech. of English	Spelling
City	101.57	48	48	54	64	47	42
Poverty Area--Avalon	87.29	20	21	21	43	18	19
Poverty Area--Boyle Heights	86.61	18	18	17	44	17	16
Poverty Area--[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Poverty Area--Watts	90.77	20	24	22	46	21	22
Economically Privileged Area	112.42	81	75	84	79	73	66

Table 2

Grade Eight Intelligence and Achievement Data from Schools in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

Group	I. Q.	Reading Vocab.	Reading Comp.	Arithmetic Reas.	Arithmetic Fund.	Mech. of English	Spelling
City	100.07	49	47	49	42	46	47
Poverty Area--Avalon	84.72	14	15	13	12	13	18
Poverty Area--Boyle Heights	89.17	15	20	16	15	16	19
Poverty Area--East L. A.	85.74	16	17	14	14	10	14
Poverty Area--Watts	85.89	13	16	14	10	12	21
Economically Privileged Area	112.15	79	77	78	67	74	72

Table 3

Grade Eleven Intelligence and Achievement Data from Schools in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

Group	I. Q.	Reading Vocab.	Reading Level	Comp. Speed	English Express.	Quant. Thinking
City	100.74	63	55	61	56	57
Poverty Area--Avalon	89.22	32	29	30	23	30
Poverty Area--Boyle Heights	89.27	34	29	30	29	36
Poverty Area--East L. A.	88.20	33	30	31	30	31
Poverty Area--Watts	85.74	27	24	24	19	28
Economically Privileged Area	110.79	82	73	79	78	78

There are a number of things to note in the tables. First, the economically privileged area students at all three levels show higher average IQ scores than the citywide average, and students from the economically disadvantaged areas show lower IQ scores than the citywide average. It is important, however, to note that none of the average scores are so low as to preclude the average student in these areas from learning to read and write by the fifth grade. It is also significant to note the consistently low percentiles obtained in the poverty areas in the language achievement tests, especially reading, vocabulary, reading comprehension, arithmetic reasoning (which requires reading ability), mechanics of English, and spelling. At the fifth grade level these scores all run between the 16th and 24th percentile. Note also that the scores are lower consistently at the eighth grade level; in percentile achievement running now essentially between the 12th and 19th percentile. The apparent increase at the eleventh grade level can be attributed to the elimination from the group of those low achievers who have dropped out of school. These fifth and eighth grade reading scores indicate an achievement level so low as to be functionally illiterate.

It should be pointed out, however, that these judgments are based on the average scores attained by the pupils. About one-half the pupils tested had scores higher than the average shown. Thus, one should not conclude that all pupils in the disadvantaged areas studied are functionally illiterate. Rather, the proportion who could be so classified is much greater than would be true for all pupils of the same grade in the City or in the nation.

While the test data provided by the schools in the County area is not as complete and as appropriately organized as that of Los Angeles City, the general thrust of the data leads to comparable conclusions. Most equivalent test data, if it were obtainable from other large cities, would also show a similar pattern. It is also appropriate to note that the Los Angeles citywide test averages reflect favorably on the citywide program. The achievement level in the economically privileged areas indicates effective achievement in relation to ability.

SECTION II

CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOLS IN THE ADVANTAGED AND DISADVANTAGED AREAS

To obtain the information for this section, an outline of the kind of information needed was first approved by the Commission staff and then reviewed with members of the administrative staff of the Los Angeles School District and the nearby county districts. On the basis of that outline and the discussions that followed, data was supplied by the schools. It was from this data that the comparisons in this section have been made. Wherever it was available, information from other cities has been used for comparison. However, very little specific data has been made available from cities outside of the study area.

Class Size

A number of factors are involved in any examination of class size. Most school districts report class size on the basis of ratio of pupil personnel to certificated personnel. On this basis, Table 4 shows the figures for the five comparison districts in Los Angeles City. Clearly the disadvantaged areas have a lower ratio of pupil personnel to certificated personnel in the elementary school.

Table 4

Elementary Class Size--Ratio of Pupil Personnel to Certificated Personnel

District	Ratio
Avalon	27.8
Boyle Heights	29.7
East Los Angeles	29.4
Watts	28.5
Privileged	31.9

A second basis for comparison is shown in Table 5 where the number of teachers assigned for each of the areas is shown directly as a ratio with the number of total pupils in each area.

Table 5

Elementary Class Size--Ratio of Pupils to Classroom Teachers

District	Teachers	Pupils	Ratio
Avalon	320	9,357	29.2
Boyle Heights	435	13,660	31.2
East Los Angeles	442	13,728	31.1
Watts	582	17,551	30.2
Privileged	235	7,948	33.8

This figure excludes administrators but includes educable mentally retarded classes, compensatory teachers, reserve teachers, and social adjustment classes. All of these would tend to reduce the averages attained in the disadvantaged areas in comparison with the privileged areas. The complete report is included in the appendix.

Additional information was provided by the Los Angeles City Schools on size of classes and number of teachers in the elementary schools as of the second month of the school year 1965-66. The data from this report shows that when only regular schools and classes are considered, the economically privileged area and the economically disadvantaged areas both have, for the most part, lower class size than the citywide average. See Table 6. (Note East Los Angeles is higher.)

At the high school level additional factors have to be considered in comparing class size. First, classes in different subjects normally vary considerably. For instance, science classes are frequently limited in size by the equipment and laboratory space available. This is seldom the case in physical education. Los Angeles Schools have provided a very complete report of class size by subject for the five comparison areas and the total district combined average, all by subject. The complete report is included in the appendix.

However, some of the key differences can be noted here. First, English classes, for example, show consistently lower average class size in all four of the disadvantaged areas in comparison to the combined district average, while the average class size in the privileged area is higher than the districtwide average. In both science and mathematics this is also true. In fact, it is a very consistent pattern that, subject by subject, the class size in the disadvantaged areas is smaller than that of the districtwide average, and class size is larger in the economically privileged area than the districtwide average.

Table 6

Average Number of Pupils Per Classroom

District	Elementary	High School
Avalon	31.2	30.3
Boyle Heights	32.7	31.7
East Los Angeles	33.0	34.7
Watts	30.9	31.7
Privileged	31.3	33.3
Citywide	33.3	31.8

One additional fact is apparent from an examination of the tables on class size included in the appendix. There were no classes larger than 44 in any of the elementary schools in the comparison areas. There were no classes larger than 39 in Watts and Avalon. There were more classes larger than 39 in the economically privileged area than in any of the disadvantaged areas. There were more classes in the 25-29 size range in Watts than any of the other comparison areas and fewer classes in the 25-29, or lower ranges, in the economically privileged area than in any of the disadvantaged areas. This information is based on regular school class enrollments.

These figures are based on enrollment. Figures based on A.D.A.* are lower in the disadvantaged areas. On the other hand, the turnover, or transiency rate, is considerably higher in the disadvantaged areas in comparison to the privileged areas. The total number of different students encountered by the teachers in the disadvantaged areas may, therefore, be much higher than that for the teachers in the advantaged areas. The report prepared by the Budget Division of the Los Angeles Schools is included in the appendix to this report.

One additional note should be made here. Although transiency factors are higher for the disadvantaged areas, the Los Angeles City Schools have

*Average Daily Attendance

been recognized as having one of the lowest dropout rates in the nation. While clearly the higher transiency rates make the problem of educating the students more difficult, the school district has consistently attempted to compensate for this by reducing class size in the disadvantaged areas.

Class size in the disadvantaged county school districts included in this study must also be examined. Compton City Schools approximate the Los Angeles City average for elementary schools. Compton Union High School District has a severe problem in attempting to provide adequate space. At this time its class size is higher in the Willowbrook Schools than it is in the disadvantaged areas of the Los Angeles City Schools. Enterprise elementary schools have average class sizes about the same as for Los Angeles City disadvantaged areas and frequently lower than for the advantaged areas of the City.

It is fair to generalize that in the County schools, as well as in the City schools, any significant difference between class size in the disadvantaged areas and the advantaged areas favors the disadvantaged areas. When this generalization is joined with the fact that daily attendance is also consistently lower in the disadvantaged areas, we must conclude that the class size alone does not contribute to unequal learning opportunities for the children in the disadvantaged areas. For further discussion of the problem, please read the section of this report entitled Recommendations.

Teacher Personnel

Frequently, those commenting on schools in disadvantaged areas have asserted that the assignment of inferior teachers to these areas is a major problem. To obtain factual information regarding this allegation, we have examined the following data: the performance reports on non-permanent teachers from the Elementary Division and the Secondary Division of the Los Angeles City Schools, the years of experience of all teachers in the comparison areas, the employment status (certification qualifications) of all teachers in the comparison districts, and the length of employment for each teacher in each of the comparison districts (teacher mobility).

Employment Status of Teachers

One basis for assessing the quality of teachers is their employment status. For example, the most intensive examination of the effectiveness of the teacher is generally made in a school district before tenure, or permanent status, is conferred on the teacher. Thus, presumably only the most competent teachers are awarded permanent employment status. During the three years while the teacher is earning permanent status he must have a standard, rather than a provisional, credential. The provisional status, therefore, indicates a teacher without a standard teaching credential. In California, at the present time, a teacher may qualify for a provisional credential simply on the basis of any 90 units (approximately three years) of college work in any combination of subjects in any accredited institution. The school district and the county superintendent must also attest to a shortage of teachers with a standard credential. Ordinarily, a teacher on a provisional credential is less well prepared than a teacher with a standard credential.

In Los Angeles an additional type of employment status, called conditional, is also possible. Usually, a teacher on conditional status is one who has a standard credential but has not completed the Los Angeles City examination. A last type of employment status is that of substitute. In this report substitute refers to long-term substitute. Much leeway is allowed local boards of education in obtaining substitute teachers. Generally, a substitute teacher does not have a long range commitment to teaching. Most often substitutes work on provisional credentials. While serving as a substitute, a teacher does not ordinarily make progress toward tenure. Data for the five comparison districts have been prepared by the Los Angeles City Schools on the employment status of elementary and secondary teachers.

Table 7

Percentage of Elementary Teachers in Each Type of Employment Status for the Five Comparison Districts of Los Angeles

District	Permanent	Probationary	Conditional	Provisional	Substitute
Avalon	56.29	28.44	9.88	.30	3.59
Boyle Heights	56.66	25.06	14.90	.23	2.93
East Los Angeles	58.76	22.17	15.08	.44	3.33
Watts	60.40	25.13	7.49	.17	6.49
Privileged	80.17	12.81	2.89	.41	2.89

An examination of both Tables 7 and 8 shows a similar pattern. The percentage of teachers on permanent status is lower in the disadvantaged areas than in the advantaged area. It should be noted also that the percentage of substitute teachers is particularly high in the Watts area in comparison with both the other disadvantaged areas and the economically privileged area. Why Watts should have 6.5 per cent of substitute teachers on the elementary level in contrast to a 3.5 per cent figure for the other disadvantaged areas is not known.

Table 8

Percentage of Secondary Teachers in Each Type of Employment Status for the Five Comparison Districts of Los Angeles

District	Permanent	Probationary	Conditional	Provisional	Substitute
Avalon	52.10	23.82	11.48	4.76	7.0
Boyle Heights	57.42	21.01	11.37	4.24	5.97
East Los Angeles	52.29	24.57	14.57	2.57	6.0
Watts	48.64	21.42	12.93	4.08	12.93
Privileged	75.40	12.60	8.65	1.62	1.35
Privileged (Growth)*	57.75	22.54	13.52	3.66	2.54

*Granada Hills

At the secondary level there are only 1.35 substitute teachers in the economically privileged area while almost 13 per cent of the teachers in the Watts area are substitute teachers, and approximately 6 per cent of the teachers in the other disadvantaged areas are substitutes. In addition, there are almost 13 per cent of the Watts secondary teachers on conditional employment status. In the other disadvantaged areas conditional employment ranges from 11 per cent to 14.5 per cent while 8.5 per cent of the teachers in the economically privileged area are employed as conditionals. There is some difference in the employment status of teachers between advantaged areas and the disadvantaged areas, and this is more evident at the secondary level than at the elementary level. This difference seems much smaller if "growth" privileged areas are included.

Education of Teachers

Years of education is frequently assumed to be a criterion of the effectiveness of teachers. The Los Angeles City Schools prepared data showing the percentage of teachers in each of the five comparison districts holding bachelor's degrees, master's degrees, or doctor's degrees as the highest earned degree. Tables 9 and 10 summarize this data.

The difference in proportion of master's degrees to bachelor's degrees between the disadvantaged and the advantaged areas is small, but it favors the advantaged area. This difference may reflect the difference in total teaching experience rather than a qualitative difference in the comparison teacher groups.

Table 9

Highest Degree Earned by Percentage of Elementary Teachers in Each of the Five Comparison Districts of Los Angeles

District	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctor's	Other
Avalon	80.54	18.26	0	1.20
Boyle Heights	81.04	16.48	0	2.48
East Los Angeles	83.15	15.52	0	1.33
Watts	79.53	18.64	0	1.83
Privileged	76.86	19.83	0	3.31

Table 10

Highest Degree Earned by Percentage of Secondary Teachers in Each of the Five Comparison Districts of Los Angeles

District	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctor's	Other
Avalon	58.54	36.41	.84	4.20
Boyle Heights	71.29	26.40	.77	1.54
East Los Angeles	69.71	28.00	.86	1.43
Watts	66.67	31.63	.34	1.36
Privileged	59.19	38.92	1.35	.54

Experience of Teachers

Evaluating the quality of teacher personnel on the basis of years of experience has many hazards. The assumption that more experience necessarily means a more effective teacher is not a valid assumption. Frequently, the most effective teachers are those with three to eight years of experience who are themselves still eager to learn, physically active, and mentally alert. However, if all other factors of vitality, intelligence, motivation, and training are equal, then clearly increased experience should have a direct correlation with increased teacher effectiveness.

The Los Angeles City Schools have prepared a very complete summary of the experience of the elementary and secondary teachers. This data has been organized to show the years of experience in the school where the teacher is presently assigned, the years of experience in Los Angeles, the years of experience outside of Los Angeles, and the total years of teaching experience. The following information, Tables 11, 12 and 13, on the elementary and secondary schools was taken from the IBM data supplied by the Los Angeles City District. For a first comparison we can examine the total years of experience for teachers in the five comparison areas.

Table 11

Average of Total Years of Experience for Elementary and Secondary Teachers for the Five Comparison Districts of Los Angeles

District	Elementary	Secondary
Avalon	9.43	9.38
Boyle Heights	9.80	9.09
East Los Angeles	9.06	9.72
Watts	8.28	9.36
Privileged	11.61	11.61

A second method of comparing experience is to look at the average length of time that teachers have spent in the school in which they are presently assigned.

Table 12

Average Years of Experience in Present Assignment for the Five Comparison Districts of Los Angeles

District	Elementary	Secondary
Avalon	4.88	4.94
Boyle Heights	5.47	4.04
East Los Angeles	4.83	4.50
Watts	4.02	4.56
Privileged	4.66	4.35

A third method of comparing experience of teachers is to examine the average years of experience within Los Angeles.

Table 13

Average Years of Experience within Los Angeles City Schools for the Five Comparison Districts of Los Angeles

District	Elementary	Secondary
Avalon	7.26	7.07
Boyle Heights	7.64	6.93
East Los Angeles	7.29	7.42
Watts	5.68	6.91
Privileged	9.93	9.79

There is a consistent difference of approximately two years in the total number of years of experience between the four disadvantaged areas and the advantaged area. Further examination of the data as presented in the additional tables, however, indicates that this difference is neither in the years of experience in the present assignment nor in the experience outside of Los Angeles. Rather, it is in total years of experience within the Los Angeles City School District. There is approximately a two-year difference in average years of experience in the Los Angeles City Schools between teachers in the four disadvantaged areas as compared to those in the advantaged area.

Two explanations for this difference seem most plausible. First, teachers choose to move to the advantaged areas, and as they gain seniority, their chances for such transfers are increased. A second explanation is that the growth in numbers of students has been greater in the disadvantaged areas during recent years than in the advantaged area, and therefore a larger number of additional teachers has been assigned during recent years. An examination of growth data (Table 14) supplied by the Los Angeles City Schools would support this latter explanation.

Additional data included in the appendix shows the increase in number of teachers assigned to each of the comparison areas for the past seven years. This data also supports the explanation that the difference in average number of years of experience between the advantaged and disadvantaged districts is the result of growth and increased number of teachers assigned to the disadvantaged areas.

Table 14

Increase in Pupil Enrollment from 1960 to 1965
in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
Avalon	8,623	8,971	9,153	9,385	9,585	9,386
Boyle Heights	12,478	13,157	13,356	13,404	13,548	13,902
East Los Angeles	13,033	13,128	13,036	13,605	13,659	13,869
Watts	15,514	15,765	17,056	17,731	17,780	17,808
Privileged	8,145	8,216	8,097	8,011	8,106	7,974

Supervisory Ratings of Teachers

Table 15 shows the districtwide ratings for the secondary schools for non-permanent teachers. This includes substitutes, provisionals, conditionals, and probationary teachers. Probationary teachers are regularly credentialed teachers who have not yet achieved permanent status or tenure. Conditionals are teachers who are regularly credentialed but have not yet had the opportunity to take the Los Angeles City examinations. Provisionals are teachers who hold a provisional teaching certificate rather than a standard teaching certificate. Thus, they are not fully credentialed. Substitute teachers are those employed, generally, on a short term contract. Ordinarily they are not working toward permanent status within the district.

Table 15

Performance Reports for Non-Permanent Secondary Teachers
in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Unsatisfactory	Weak	Satisfactory	Strong	Outstanding
Avalon	0	2	33	89	35
Boyle Heights	0	0	63	95	35
East Los Angeles	1	0	59	74	16
Watts	0	9	50	52	16
Privileged	0	0	24	30	17
Citywide	1	11	205	310	102

About 16 per cent of the non-permanent teachers in the secondary schools in the disadvantaged areas received an outstanding rating, about 50 per cent received a strong rating, about 32 per cent received a satisfactory rating, and about 2 per cent received a weak or unsatisfactory rating.

Table 15 also shows a similar summary for performance ratings of non-permanent teachers in the economically advantaged areas. Approximately 24 per cent of these teachers were rated outstanding, approximately 43 per cent were rated strong, approximately 33 per cent were rated satisfactory, and none was rated unsatisfactory or weak.

Over-all, the ratings on these non-permanent teachers are approximately the same in the economically privileged area as they are in the disadvantaged areas in the secondary schools report. Ratings are not made on teachers who gain permanent status, so there is no data available on these teachers.

The elementary schools in the economically privileged area show ratings for non-permanent teachers in Table 16. Of 28 teachers in this category, 17 teachers are rated outstanding (60%), 10 teachers are rated strong (36%), one teacher was rated satisfactory (4%), and none was rated unsatisfactory or weak.

Table 16

Performance Reports for Non-Permanent Elementary Teachers
in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Unsatisfactory	Weak	Satisfactory	Strong	Outstanding
Avalon	0	2	9	41	35
Boyle Heights	0	0	41	65	12
East Los Angeles	0	0	10	56	40
Watts	0	0	30	78	30
Privileged	0	0	1	10	17

When the data from the four disadvantaged areas are combined, 117 out of 435 teachers (27%) are rated outstanding, 240 teachers (56%) are rated strong, 76 teachers (16%) are rated satisfactory, and 2 teachers (.4%) are rated weak. Insofar as this data is concerned, it would appear that the non-permanent teachers in the advantaged area have received higher ratings than those teaching in the disadvantaged areas, and these percentage differences are very large. It should be noted, however, that the number of non-permanent teachers involved in the advantaged area is very small, so that the apparent differences are greatly reduced when data from growth advantaged area is added (see Table 17).

Table 17

Percentage of Teachers in Each Performance Category in Combined Advantaged and Disadvantaged Areas

Area	Unsatisfactory Or Weak	Satisfactory	Strong	Outstanding
Disadvantaged	2%	32%	50%	16%
Advantaged (Stable and Growth)	0%	26%	56%	18%

Condition of Buildings and Physical Plant

In addition to the characteristics of students, class size, and quality of teacher personnel, the physical environment can affect the quality of an educational program. While older and more established residential areas are more likely to have older physical plants, there are a number of bases upon which a comparison can be made. The data in this regard supplied by the Finance Sections of the Los Angeles City Schools is extensive.

A careful examination of all the policies and budgetary rules relating to repainting of buildings, replacing of capital equipment, maintaining school grounds, refinishing and replacing furniture, and maintaining yard equipment indicates that the disadvantaged areas have not been treated differently from the privileged area. The custodial care of the schools is also affected by the custodian, gardener, and building engineer assignments. The rules and formulas for these are exactly the same for all areas of the City.

Allowance, of course, has been made for the fact that in both advantaged and disadvantaged areas there are some new schools. However, as Table 18 shows, the average of the four poverty areas shows a higher annual average expenditure per ADA than that for the total district or the privileged area. The Watts area itself, in contrast to the other disadvantaged areas, does show a lower average annual expenditure per ADA for maintenance. It is likely that this can be attributed to a larger proportion of newer classrooms in the Watts area than in the other disadvantaged areas, for districtwide policy has apparently been applied equally throughout the unified school district.

Table 18

Average Annual Expenditure per Average Daily Attendance for Maintenance in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Average Annual Expenditure
Avalon	$32.82
Boyle Heights	34.61
East Los Angeles	30.45
Watts	25.01
Average*	30.75
Privileged*	28.24
Citywide	28.59

*Four elementary schools and one high school not included as they were built within the five year period.

Portable Classrooms

Table 19 shows the ratio of the number of permanent classrooms to the number of portable classrooms. We would expect, because the disadvantaged areas are higher growth during the past five to ten years, that there would be a higher proportion of portable classrooms. This is not the case. Apparently the construction of permanent classrooms in relation to need has been at least as great, or greater, in the disadvantaged areas as in the advantaged area.

Double Sessions

Another indication of the adequacy of school plant is the number, or proportion, of double session classes. Table 20 shows the number of double session classes in each of the five comparison areas. It would have been difficult to compare this data among the five districts without converting it to a percentage of classes, were it not that there are no double session classes in the advantaged area chosen. In the disadvantaged areas there is a range of from 12 to 39 double session classes. This circumstance may be explained on the basis of pupil growth and the number of students in the disadvantaged areas compared to the advantaged area. (See Table 21.)

Table 19

Ratio of Permanent to Portable Classrooms in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Ratio of Permanent to Portable
Avalon	72.28
Boyle Heights	83.17
East Los Angeles	80.20
Watts	76.24
Privileged	72.28
Citywide	
Elementary	74.26
Secondary	82.18
Total	77.23

Table 20

Number of Double Session Elementary Classes in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Number of Double Sessions
Avalon	24
Boyle Heights	12
East Los Angeles	39
Watts	15
Privileged	0

Table 21 shows double sessions as a percentage of enrollment in each of the five comparison areas in 1955 and 1965.

Table 21

Number of Pupils on Double Sessions in 1955 and 1965 in Comparison Areas and Advantaged Growth Area of Los Angeles

District	Number of Pupils on Double Sessions	% of Total Enrollment	Number of Pupils on Double Sessions	% of Total Enrollment
	1955		1965	
Avalon	240	3.8%	1,152	12.3%
Boyle Heights	202	2.0%	704	5.2%
East Los Angeles	922	8.9%	1,499	10.0%
Watts	2,478	26.2%	453	2.6%
Privileged	583	8.0%	--	--
Privileged (Growth)*	364	23.2%	577	4.7%
Citywide	37,731	9.5%	40,299	6.6%

*Granada Hills

Transportation Schedule

Directly related to the use, size, and condition of the physical plant is the arrangement for transporting of students within a geographic area. The policy of the Los Angeles School Board is explicit in this regard, and it is identical throughout the school district. A copy of this policy is included in the appendix.

Cafeteria

Special facilities also reflect on the quality of the educational program offered in the school. District policies, formulas, and rules regarding special facilities are the same in every school. However, although the policy is the same, it has discriminatory effects. The differential impact of identical cafeteria policy vividly illustrates this point.

Existing policy is (1) that cafeterias be self-supporting, and (2) that no new cafeterias be constructed. Self-support has always been policy; the prohibition against building new cafeterias went into effect when the 1958 bond funds were expended.

Clearly, growth areas are those most severely affected by the no-new-cafeteria edict. Unfortunately, these growth areas tend also to be the disadvantaged areas. The requirement that cafeterias support themselves only compounds the problem--advantaged areas do so easily; it is quite infeasible for the disadvantaged areas to do the same. A summary report on the school lunch program is included in the appendix. Table 22 shows the number of schools without operating cafeterias in the five comparison areas.

Table 22

Number of Schools Without Operating Cafeterias (as of 1955-65) in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Number of Schools
Avalon	2
Boyle Heights	9
East Los Angeles	4
Watts	9
Privileged	0

In California the cost of meals for economically disadvantaged youth may be supplied by a districtwide override tax. Many school districts use this source to aid in the cost of maintaining the school lunch programs, particularly in the disadvantaged areas. This is not being done in the Los Angeles City Schools.

Instructional Equipment and Materials

Equipment and materials, including textbooks, library collections, audio visual equipment, audio visual service, films, filmstrips, picture collections, and laboratory materials, all contribute to the effectiveness of the instructional program. The rules and policies by which this equipment is made available are determined by districtwide policy. However, the Los Angeles City School administration has provided some detailed information on the availability of all instructional equipment and materials in the comparison areas. There appears to be no consistent difference between the disadvantaged and privileged areas at the secondary level either in the size of the collections or in the average books per pupil.

Library

At the elementary level, not every school has a library. In the Avalon District three out of nine schools do not have a library, although one of the three schools does have a library book collection. In Boyle Heights District seven out of eighteen elementary schools do not have libraries. In East Los Angeles two schools out of fourteen do not have libraries. In the Watts District one school out of seventeen does not have a library. In the economically privileged area all of the elementary schools have libraries.

The size of the elementary school collections throughout the comparison areas ranges from a low of 1,074 volumes in the privileged area to a high of 4,190 volumes at one school in the East Los Angeles area. The average books per pupil range from a low of 1.2 at one school in the Avalon area to a high of 5.4 at one school in the East Los Angeles District. So far as the size of the collections and the books per child, there appears to be no consistent difference between the advantaged and disadvantaged areas.

The policy for the establishment of libraries is as follows:

> Libraries are established in elementary schools in all areas (1) if a new school is being built, (2) if there is a new building program in an already established school, or (3) if a classroom is available to be converted to a library. A basic minimum book collection of approximately 1,650 volumes is purchased for each library as it is established. Schools which do not have a library receive classroom collections of library books for each teacher from the Circulation Department of the Library Section. In addition, any teacher who works in a special program within the school, i.e., remedial reading, special education, social adjustment, reading improvement, gifted, individualized reading, compensatory program, or pre-school, may obtain additional materials from the Library Section on request.

Audio Visual

The allocation for films, film strips, picture kits, phonograph records, wall charts, etc., and for school journeys is made on a uniform quota basis throughout all schools in the City. Such quotas are based on either the number of teachers in the school or the total enrollment.

One of the questions raised in this study was to ascertain not only the availability but the use made of audio visual equipment and services in the five comparison areas. The data included in the appendix on this question is supplied by the Audio Visual Services Section. This data indicates that between 1963 and 1965 the number of films delivered to schools was about the same per teacher in the advantaged and disadvantaged areas. The number of "school journeys" was considerably higher in the disadvantaged areas than in the advantaged area; in fact, it was almost twice as high. Audio visual consultant service visits to the schools were about equal between the advantaged and disadvantaged areas. Service by teachers on the evaluation committees for audio visual aids was, on the average, about equal between advantaged and disadvantaged areas in 1964-65, and the technical service visits to the schools was considerably higher in the disadvantaged areas when compared to the advantaged area.

Texts

Table 23 shows the expenditure of textbook funds at the secondary level in the five comparison areas. The lowest expenditure per student at the junior high level and at the senior high level was in the privileged area.

Table 23

Expenditure of Textbook Funds in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Average per junior high pupil	Average per senior high pupil
Avalon	$6.73	$10.12
Boyle Heights	8.11	8.85
East Los Angeles	8.315	10.46
Watts	7.03[a]	11.4[a]
Privileged	6.66	9.54

Basic supplementary textbooks for use in the elementary schools and in grades seven and eight of the junior high schools are supplied without charge by the State of California. In addition, certain supplementary sets (mostly readers) are circulated to the elementary schools through the Library Section. There appears to be no consistent difference between the advantaged and disadvantaged areas in the distribution of textbook funds.

Supplies for Instruction

Table 24 shows the average expenses of supplies for instruction per unit of ADA for the five-year period of 1959-60 to 1963-64. It shows that at both the elementary and secondary level the economically privileged area received less than the disadvantaged areas.

Table 24

Los Angeles Unified School District Average Expenses of Instructional Supplies per Unit of Average Daily Attendance for Five-Year Period 1959-60 through 1963-64

District	Elementary Schools	Secondary Schools
Avalon	$4.17	$8.00
Boyle Heights	4.09	7.66
East Los Angeles	4.25	8.03
Watts	4.37	8.60
Average	4.23	8.02
Privileged	3.88	6.73
Citywide	3.99	8.12

General Financial Support

The policies for expenditure of funds in the Los Angeles Schools are uniform for the whole district. In recent years, however, there has been more total financial support for the operation of the schools in the disadvantaged areas because of added federal funds, so that the total financial support per student is higher in the disadvantaged areas than throughout the rest of the district (see Table 25). The future prospect is that an even greater difference in favor of the disadvantaged areas will occur.

New Curriculum Developments

One of the most difficult areas in which to obtain factual data is the effect of new curriculum developments in the various districts of the City. Both elementary and secondary branches have provided considerable information on this question. Several tables are included in the appendix.

It appears that all of the comparison areas have participated to some extent in all of the curriculum committee projects and studies during the past two years, and every area has had some representation on these committees and service from the "professional experts." This includes the Spelling Study, New Reading Program, Mathematics Study, Report Card, Experimental Science Laboratories, Tape Study Center Materials, Written English, Economic Education, Programmed Learning, and Non-English Speaking Program.

Table 25

Los Angeles Unified School District Average Expenses of Instruction per Unit of Average Daily Attendance for Five-Year Period 1959-60 through 1963-64

District	Elementary Schools	Junior High Schools	Combined Junior-Senior High Schools	Senior High Schools
Avalon	$275.00	$388.66	$------	$439.25
Boyle Heights	272.70	396.90	451.57	438.60
East Los Angeles	278.65	386.72	------	432.67
Watts	276.31	364.38	------	514.43
Average	275.75	383.53	451.57	447.22
Privileged	276.44	365.21	------	385.29
Citywide	264.06	368.69	408.17	412.55

The single exception seems to be involvement in programs for gifted children; there is more active participation in the economically privileged area than in the disadvantaged areas. On the other hand, in the Non-English Speaking Program and the Culturally Disadvantaged Study active participation is in the disadvantaged schools. Table 26 shows the percentage of elementary teachers and administrators participating in the various academic subject studies.

From Table 26, it is apparent that the participation of elementary teachers in the disadvantaged areas is equal to, or greater than, that of the average for the whole City. In some programs the disadvantaged areas have a higher percentage of participation than the advantaged areas, while in others the disadvantaged areas have lesser participation.

Table 26

Summary of Participation by Teachers and Administrators from Elementary Schools in Academic Subject Curriculum Committees

District	Number of Teachers & Principals from Study Areas	Percent of Total Representation (314)	Number of Elementary Schools in Study Areas	Percent of Total Elem. Schools (429)
Avalon	11	3.5%	9	2.1%
Boyle Heights	16	5.0%	18	4.2%
East Los Angeles	18	5.7%	14	3.3%
Watts	25	7.9%	17	4.0%
Privileged	22	7.0%	12	2.7%

At the secondary level, the picture is less favorable to the disadvantaged areas but not greatly different. Tables 27 and 28 show that at the junior high level 80 per cent of the schools in the sample are disadvantaged area schools and 78 per cent of teachers in all committees represent such schools. From the privileged area, 20 per cent of the schools are in the sample and 22 per cent of the teachers are on committees representing them.

At the senior high school level 75 per cent of the schools in the sample are disadvantaged area schools while only 66 per cent of the teachers on all committees represent such schools. In the privileged area 25 per cent of the schools constitute the sample and 34 per cent of the teachers on all committees represent such schools. It should be pointed out that most of this difference is on the several advisory committees and represents particularly a high representation of University High School.

An additional clue to the degree of participation of schools in new curriculum development is the availability of new curriculum materials. An examination of the schedule for distribution of these materials indicates that such materials are available on an equal basis throughout the entire City.

Table 27

Representation on Citywide Curriculum Committees of Junior High Teachers from Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 1964-65

	Disadvantaged		Privileged	
Curriculum Committees	Number	%	Number	%
Number of Schools	8	80%	2	20%
Curriculum Development Committee Members	16	76%	5	24%
Subject Advisory Committee Members	9	83%	2	17%
Text Book Committee Members	15	79%	4	21%
Total	40	78%	11	22%

Table 28

Representation on Citywide Curriculum Committees of Senior High Teachers from Comparison Areas of Los Angeles 1964-65

	Disadvantaged		Privileged	
Curriculum Committees	Number	%	Number	%
Number of Schools	6	75%	2	25%
Curriculum Development Committee Members	15	68%	7	32%
Subject Advisory Committee Members	8	53%	7	47%
Text Book Committee Members	17	71%	7	29%
Total	40	66%	21	34%

Availability of Special Services

The availability of most special services is on an equal basis throughout the district. However, the ratio of counselors to students is much more favorable in the disadvantaged areas than the advantaged area. Tables 29 and 30 show the ratio of elementary counselors and the ratio of secondary counselors to pupils in the study areas. Also, special services from the Division of Special Education are much more concentrated in the disadvantaged areas than the advantaged area. Administrative, supervisory, and consultant personnel are equal, except that a special Office of Urban Affairs in the Board of Education Building gives concentrated attention to problems in the disadvantaged areas. All of the differences in the extent and availability of special services are in favor of the disadvantaged areas. The single possible exception, again, is in programs and classes for the gifted.

Table 29

Ratio of Elementary Counselors to Pupils
September 1965

District	Number of Pupils per Counselor
Avalon	1,434
Boyle Heights	3,872
East Los Angeles	2,726
Watts	2,368
Average	2,316
Privileged	4,265
Citywide	4,265

Table 30

Ratio of Secondary Counselors to Pupils
1964-65

District	Number of Pupils per Counselor
Avalon	360
Boyle Heights	365
East Los Angeles	391
Watts	471
Average	388
Privileged	613
Citywide	540

Adult School Program

Last spring and summer heavy allocations of Economic Opportunity Act funds augmented adult education programs in the poverty schools. By concentrating EOA funds in the poverty adult schools it was possible to provide a larger summer school program for adults than that offered in the previous year.

Though the total number of adults served at University Adult School was higher in 1964-65, the poverty schools serve fewer individuals for larger blocks of time in classes geared toward the completion of an education and the accumulation of a salable skill (see Table 31).

Table 32 shows that the "Number of Teacher, Counselor, and Branch Coordinator Hours" for poverty schools meets or exceeds the University figures. Adult schools in the disadvantaged area appear to offer as much service to the individual student as the University Adult School.

Table 31

Analysis of Comparison Area Adult Schools in Los Angeles 1964-1965

School	Number of H. S. Diplomas Issued	Number 8th Grade Diplomas Issued	Number Certificates Issued	1964-1965 A.D.A.	1964-1965 Cumulative Enrollment
Fremont	159	32	116	695	5,687
Garfield	71	60	21	741	5,038
Jefferson	154	46	20	668	4,163
Jordan	43	10	74	407	3,646
Lincoln	43	22	19	870	6,269
Manual Arts	178	19	162	1,046	8,517
Roosevelt	86	51	62	900	7,553
University	70	0	71	808	1,096
Total	804	204	585	6,135	51,969

Table 32

Analysis of Comparison Area Adult Schools in Los Angeles 1965-1966 as Financed by District Funds

School	No. Teacher, Counselor & Branch Coord. Hrs. Per Month	Total Number Classes Scheduled	Campus Number of Classes	Branch Locations Number of Locations	Branch Locations Number Day & Evening Classes
Fremont	1,820	108	80	8	28
Garfield	1,549	63	37	7	26
Jefferson	1,755	80	68	8	12
Jordan	1,335	74	53	7	21
Lincoln	2,104	119	74	14	45
Manual Arts	2,569	137	103	10	34
Roosevelt	2,142	85	63	11	22
University	1,990	110	63	9	47
Total	15,264	776	541	74	235

SECTION III

HOW TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND SOME PARENTS VIEW THE SCHOOLS

Teachers' and Administrators' View of the Schools

Facts are necessary to answer questions as important as those raised in this study, but facts are not enough. In addition to the statistics that show the equipment, instructional material, sizes of classes, buildings, libraries, test scores, etc., some attempt must be made to evaluate the attitudes of the people involved.

How do the teachers in the disadvantaged areas view their teaching assignment? How do they evaluate the administrators with whom they work? What is the teacher's and principal's attitude toward the abilities and motivation of the students they teach? How do the parents in the community view the schools? Do they feel their children are being taught well, being treated fairly? Do the parents participate in the attempts of the school to improve its educational program? How do administrators view their assignments to schools in such areas? Are they eager to move to more advantaged areas? How do they evaluate their teachers and the parents with whom they work? The responses to these questions reflect the attitudes of the persons involved. This section of the report was designed to determine such attitudes.

Three questionnaires were devised to tap information not available by other means. The teacher questionnaire was distributed to all of the secondary teachers in the five comparison areas in Los Angeles and in the disadvantaged area of the Compton Union High School District. It was distributed to all of the elementary teachers in the elementary schools in Avalon, Boyle Heights, East Los Angeles, Watts, a privileged area, and the Compton area. Because of the large number of elementary schools, one half of the schools were selected from an alphabetical list. The questionnaire was distributed at a teachers' meeting and returned in a sealed envelope through the Urban Affairs office to the Commission office. Every effort was made to maintain complete anonymity of response. The administrators' questionnaire was devised, distributed and collected in the same manner as the teachers' questionnaire. Respondents were administrators who actually serve at the building level.

The parent questionnaire was used as a structured interview. Twenty parents, ten with children in the elementary schools, five with children in junior high schools, and five with children in the senior high schools were interviewed in each of the six areas. In the Compton area, the parent questionnaire in the elementary schools was from the Willowbrook School District. No claim is made that these one hundred and twenty parents are a cross section of the parents in these areas. They were interviewed in order that we might have some communication from a larger number of parents than has yet been obtained by any other investigation of these school problems. Each of the parents was selected from a list supplied by the schools. The only criterion was that their children be in the present school for at least two years. The interviews were conducted by graduate students who either are or were teaching in public schools. Mexican-American students interviewed in the Mexican-American area and Negro students interviewed in the Negro area. The results of the questionnaire are contained in the tables included in this section.

Three questions each from the teacher questionnaire and the administrator questionnaire and two questions from the parent questionnaire are not included in table form. These were open-end questions. In the parent questionnaire, these open questions were: "What improvements, if any, do you consider most needed in the schools?" and "Do you have any additional comments, suggestions, or recommendations to give to the Governor's Commission; please describe them." In the teacher and administrator questionnaires, these open questions include: "What improvements, if any, do you consider most needed in your teaching situation?" "What, if any, are the advantages in your present teaching assignment?" "If you have any additional comments, suggestions, or recommendations to give to the Governor's Commission, please describe them here." Comments on the replies to these questions are included in the summary at the end of the section.

Attitude Toward School Assignment

One of the problems in every major city is migration of experienced teachers out of schools in the disadvantaged areas toward schools in the more advantaged areas. This situation is present in every large city. One of the questions asked of all of the teachers and administrators was, "How do you view your present school assignment?" Tables 33, 34, 35, and 36 summarize the answers.

While there is a consistently higher percentage of teachers and administrators who indicate they are eager to stay in the present assignment in the advantaged area than in the disadvantaged area, in all areas 80% or more indicate that they are eager to stay and would not like to transfer. Further, among teachers in the elementary level and among special teachers, only 1 or 2% in each area indicate they are eager to transfer. The highest percentage making this preference is at the secondary level in the disadvantaged schools where in some areas 4 and 5% have indicated they are eager to transfer. This would seem to indicate that most personnel are willing to stay in their present assignments.

Table 33

Attitude toward School Assignment by Elementary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Am eager to stay		Would not like to transfer		Would like to transfer		Am eager to transfer	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	87	34%	132	51%	34	13%	5	2%
Boyle Heights	40	36%	60	55%	10	9%	0	0%
Compton, etc.	258	40%	320	50%	51	8%	9	2%
East Los Angeles	121	57%	78	37%	13	6%	1	--%
Watts	80	38%	109	51%	21	10%	3	1%
Privileged	123	62%	64	33%	9	5%	1	--%

Table 34

Attitude toward School Assignment by Secondary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Am eager to stay		Would not like to transfer		Would like to transfer		Am eager to transfer	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	97	35%	107	40%	54	20%	12	4%
Boyle Heights	163	45%	135	37%	55	15%	8	2%
Compton, etc.	133	38%	157	45%	55	16%	4	1%
East Los Angeles	136	45%	130	44%	21	10%	4	1%
Watts	84	34%	89	36%	60	25%	13	5%
Privileged	201	65%	98	32%	11	4%	1	--%

Table 35

Attitude toward School Assignment by Special Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Am eager to stay		Would not like to transfer		Would like to transfer		Am eager to transfer	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	43	48%	36	40%	8	10%	2	2%
Boyle Heights	58	60%	26	33%	5	6%	1	1%
Compton	52	52%	40	40%	9	9%	0	0%
East Los Angeles	59	63%	32	34%	2	2%	1	1%
Watts	41	50%	30	36%	11	13%	1	1%
Privileged	22	61%	12	33%	2	6%	0	0%

Table 36

Attitude toward School Assignment by Administrators in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Am eager to stay		Would not like to transfer		Would like to transfer		Am eager to transfer	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	18	41%	15	34%	11	25%	0	0%
Boyle Heights	19	83%	3	13%	1	4%	0	0%
Compton, etc.	33	59%	21	38%	2	3%	0	0%
East Los Angeles	11	69%	4	25%	1	6%	0	0%
Watts	9	39%	10	43%	4	17%	0	0%
Privileged	21	91%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%

Attitude Toward Students

The attitude of teachers and administrators toward their students is extremely important in evaluating the educational environment. Whether in fact students are highly motivated or not, it is important to know how teachers and administrators view the motivation of their students. Tables 37, 38, 39, and 40 summarize this item of the questionnaire.

Table 37

Attitude toward Students as Rated by Elementary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Very interested, highly motivated		Generally interested, not highly motivated		Lazy or unmotivated	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	29	13%	169	78%	18	8%
Boyle Heights	42	28%	93	61%	17	11%
Compton, etc.	140	22%	438	67%	73	11%
East Los Angeles	16	7%	172	81%	25	12%
Watts	30	15%	151	74%	23	11%
Privileged	164	73%	53	24%	8	3%

Table 38

Attitude toward Students as Rated by Secondary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Very interested, highly motivated		Generally interested, not highly motivated		Lazy or unmotivated	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	17	6%	198	74%	54	20%
Boyle Heights	14	4%	285	75%	83	21%
Compton, etc.	34	10%	229	66%	85	24%
East Los Angeles	6	2%	212	75%	66	23%
Watts	13	5%	175	75%	47	20%
Privileged	196	71%	81	29%	1	--%

Table 39

Attitude toward Students as Rated by Special Teachers
in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Very interested, highly motivated		Generally interested, not highly motivated		Lazy or unmotivated	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	7	9%	62	77%	12	15%
Boyle Heights	5	6%	64	81%	10	13%
Compton, etc.	21	20%	69	67%	13	13%
East Los Angeles	9	10%	71	82%	7	8%
Watts	12	15%	62	78%	5	6%
Privileged	20	62%	12	38%	0	0%

Table 40

Attitude toward Students as Rated by Administrators
in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Very interested, highly motivated		Generally interested, not highly motivated		Lazy or unmotivated	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	8	17%	34	72%	5	11%
Boyle Heights	1	4%	22	81%	4	15%
Compton, etc.	12	21%	41	71%	5	8%
East Los Angeles	2	11%	16	89%	0	0%
Watts	1	4%	23	92%	1	4%
Privileged	22	96%	1	4%	0	0%

Teachers and the administrators view the students in the advantaged areas as more highly motivated toward school achievement than do teachers and administrators in the disadvantaged areas. The difference is large, consistent and significant. Among secondary teachers, practically none rate their students as lazy or unmotivated in the advantaged area, but in the disadvantaged areas, from 20 to 24% of the teachers rated their students in this manner.

Rating of the Physical Condition of the School Building

We have in Section II of this report some factual data on the size and condition of the school buildings. Apart from the facts in dollars and cents, how those who work in the buildings view their physical surroundings is also important. Tables 41, 42, 43, and 44 show the responses of teachers and administrators to the question on their view of the physical condition of the school building in which they work. Consistently at each level, the largest percentage rate their building condition as good; those who rate buildings as poor vary from 3 to 17% among the special and secondary teachers; from 2 to 22% among the elementary teachers; and from 2 to 25% among the administrators. The largest percentage rating the building as poor are the elementary teachers in the advantaged area. With this exception, there appears to be no consistent difference in rating of physical condition of the building by teachers and administrators in the advantaged and disadvantaged areas.

Table 41

Attitude toward Physical Condition of School Buildings
as Rated by Elementary Teachers in
Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Good		Average		Poor	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	139	52%	95	36%	31	12%
Boyle Heights	41	32%	69	54%	10	14%
Compton, etc.	331	50%	277	42%	57	8%
East Los Angeles	149	69%	62	29%	5	2%
Watts	131	60%	76	35%	11	5%
Privileged	117	53%	56	25%	49	22%

Table 42

Attitude toward Physical Condition of School Buildings
as Rated by Secondary Teachers in
Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Good		Average		Poor	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	131	48%	118	44%	21	8%
Boyle Heights	146	38%	195	51%	44	11%
Compton, etc.	212	61%	120	34%	17	5%
East Los Angeles	88	30%	149	53%	49	17%
Watts	138	57%	80	33%	24	10%
Privileged	213	64%	95	29%	25	7%

Table 43

Attitude toward Physical Condition of School Buildings
as Rated by Special Teachers in
Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Good		Average		Poor	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	48	55%	28	32%	11	13%
Boyle Heights	34	44%	37	47%	7	9%
Compton, etc.	54	52%	43	41%	7	7%
East Los Angeles	45	52%	36	45%	7	3%
Watts	51	61%	24	29%	9	11%
Privileged	20	54%	15	40%	3	6%

Table 44

Attitude toward Physical Condition of School Buildings as Rated by Administrators in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Good		Average		Poor	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	21	47%	13	29%	11	24%
Boyle Heights	9	36%	15	60%	1	4%
Compton, etc.	40	71%	15	27%	1	2%
East Los Angeles	11	61%	7	39%	0	0%
Watts	16	64%	7	28%	2	8%
Privileged	14	58%	4	17%	6	25%

Attitude Toward Parents

How teachers and administrators view the parents of the children they are working with also affects educational environment. Are the parents in each of the areas viewed as equally helpful and cooperative? Tables 45, 46, 27, and 48 summarize this response.

Among the elementary, secondary and special teachers, and particularly among administrators, a much larger percentage rate parents as very cooperative, very helpful in the advantaged areas than rate them in this manner in the disadvantaged areas. Conversely, the percentage that are rated uncooperative is slightly higher in the disadvantaged areas. Further, the percentage of teachers who indicate they "don't know" how to rate parents is higher in the disadvantaged than the advantaged areas.

Table 45

Attitude toward Parents as Rated by Elementary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Very cooperative, very helpful		Uninterested, uncommunicative		Uncooperative		Don't know	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	140	60%	70	29%	8	3%	21	9%
Boyle Heights	57	48%	53	45%	2	2%	7	5%
Compton, etc.	421	64%	166	25%	23	3%	51	8%
East Los Angeles	104	49%	85	40%	2	1%	21	10%
Watts	104	51%	75	37%	7	3%	19	9%
Privileged	196	92%	20	8%	0	0%	1	--%

Table 46

Attitude toward Parents as Rated by Secondary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Very cooperative, very helpful		Uninterested, uncommunicative		Uncooperative		Don't know	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	122	46%	102	38%	6	2%	38	14%
Boyle Heights	91	21%	269	61%	17	4%	61	14%
Compton, etc.	181	50%	133	37%	13	4%	34	9%
East Los Angeles	80	27%	157	52%	7	2%	56	19%
Watts	126	53%	68	29%	4	1%	40	17%
Privileged	254	85%	18	6%	3	1%	25	8%

Table 47

Attitude toward Parents as Rated by Special Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Very cooperative, very helpful		Uninterested, uncommunicative		Uncooperative		Don't know	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	40	45%	35	40%	4	5%	9	10%
Boyle Heights	40	51%	33	42%	0	0%	5	7%
Compton, etc.	62	62%	29	29%	3	3%	6	6%
East Los Angeles	42	50%	29	34%	2	2%	12	14%
Watts	43	61%	16	23%	3	4%	8	11%
Privileged	29	88%	1	3%	0	0%	3	9%

Table 48

Attitude toward Parents as Rated by Administrators in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Very cooperative, very helpful		Uninterested, uncommunicative		Uncooperative, not helpful	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	24	55%	20	45%	0	0%
Boyle Heights	13	52%	12	48%	0	0%
Compton, etc.	42	75%	12	21%	2	4%
East Los Angeles	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%
Watts	12	50%	11	46%	1	4%
Privileged	23	96%	1	4%	0	0%

Rating of School Administrators and Teachers

How effective are the building principal and assistant principals in the eyes of the teachers? Throughout the entire district only a very small percentage of teachers rate their principals as below average. Within the Los Angeles City system, two-thirds or more of the elementary teachers rate their principals as above average. More elementary and secondary teachers rate their principals as above average in the privileged area than in the disadvantaged area. Administrators were also asked to rate their teachers. With the exception of the Watts area, the administrators rated the majority of their teachers as better than average. The largest percentage giving such a rating to their teachers, however, was in the advantaged area. This information is summarized in tables 49, 50, 51, and 52.

Table 49

Rating of School Administrators by Elementary Teachers
in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Better than Average		Average		Below Average	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	167	68%	74	30%	5	2%
Boyle Heights	92	71%	35	27%	2	2%
Compton, etc.	349	53%	285	43%	24	4%
East Los Angeles	172	79%	44	20%	2	1%
Watts	141	65%	69	32%	8	4%
Privileged	189	86%	28	12%	3	2%

Table 50

Rating of School Administrators by Secondary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Better than Average		Average		Below Average	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	137	49%	118	42%	27	9%
Boyle Heights	219	58%	150	39%	11	3%
Compton, etc.	207	59%	123	35%	20	6%
East Los Angeles	156	57%	106	39%	8	4%
Watts	134	61%	69	32%	15	7%
Privileged	227	69%	81	25%	22	6%

Table 51

Rating of School Administrators by Special Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Better than Average		Average		Below Average	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	54	70%	21	27%	2	3%
Boyle Heights	58	74%	20	26%	0	0%
Compton, etc.	61	56%	43	39%	5	5%
East Los Angeles	79	86%	13	14%	0	0%
Watts	55	66%	21	25%	7	8%
Privileged	29	76%	7	19%	2	5%

Table 52

Rating of Teachers by Administrators
in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Better than Average		Average		Below Average	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	26	53%	23	47%	0	0%
Boyle Heights	17	71%	7	29%	0	0%
Compton, etc.	29	52%	26	46%	1	2%
East Los Angeles	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%
Watts	11	44%	14	56%	0	0%
Privileged	22	92%	2	8%	0	0%

Attitude Toward Central Administration

The attitude of the principals and teachers toward the central administration of the School District is important. Do the administrators or teachers in the advantaged and disadvantaged schools feel that they are neglected, treated unfairly, or discriminated against? Tables 53, 54, 55, and 56 summarize the answers to this question. Among the elementary teachers and special teachers, there appears to be no consistent difference between the percentage in the advantaged and disadvantaged areas who believe that the central administration is particularly interested in them. However, a consistently larger percentage in the disadvantaged area feel the administration is not interested in them, or that they don't know.

Table 53

Interest of Central Administration as Viewed by Elementary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Particularly interested		About equally interested		Not as interested		Don't know	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	77	30%	97	38%	39	15%	43	17%
Boyle Heights	62	49%	45	36%	6	5%	13	10%
Compton, etc.	272	42%	210	33%	56	9%	106	16%
East Los Angeles	89	41%	80	37%	8	4%	41	19%
Watts	54	28%	74	39%	46	24%	37	9%
Privileged	80	36%	112	51%	10	4%	20	9%

Table 54

Interest of Central Administration as Viewed by Secondary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Particularly interested		About equally interested		Not as interested		Don't know	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	60	23%	95	36%	52	20%	55	21%
Boyle Heights	74	26%	106	37%	39	13%	70	24%
Compton, etc.	156	45%	112	33%	21	6%	54	16%
East Los Angeles	91	32%	91	32%	26	9%	76	27%
Watts	56	23%	61	25%	56	23%	73	29%
Privileged	59	18%	150	45%	16	5%	104	32%

Table 55

Interest of Central Administration as Viewed by Special Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Particularly interested		About equally interested		Not as interested		Don't know	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	39	45%	25	29%	10	12%	12	14%
Boyle Heights	31	40%	32	42%	2	3%	12	16%
Compton, etc.	44	43%	40	39%	9	9%	10	10%
East Los Angeles	47	51%	30	33%	5	7%	8	9%
Watts	16	20%	31	39%	18	23%	15	19%
Privileged	12	32%	20	54%	1	3%	5	11%

Table 56

Interest of Central Administration as Viewed by Building Administrators in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Particularly interested		About equally interested		Not as interested	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	31	67%	15	33%	0	0%
Boyle Heights	12	48%	13	52%	0	0%
Compton, etc.	29	56%	21	40%	2	4%
East Los Angeles	14	78%	4	22%	0	0%
Watts	16	67%	7	29%	1	4%
Privileged	5	22%	15	65%	3	13%

Administrators' View of the Budget

One interesting response is shown in Table 57. The administrators were asked about the size of their budgets in relation to those in similar size schools. While the objective data would indicate that the budget is the same or greater in the disadvantaged areas, the administrators in the advantaged areas consistently indicated that they felt their budget was greater than for similar size schools throughout the district, while the administrators in the disadvantaged areas thought it was about the same.

Table 57

Attitude toward Budget as Rated by Administrators in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Greater than sim. size schools		About same as sim. size schools		Less than sim. size schools	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Avalon	16	40%	24	60%	0	0%
Boyle Heights	3	12%	22	88%	0	0%
Compton, etc.	8	14%	45	80%	3	6%
East Los Angeles	3	17%	15	83%	0	0%
Watts	7	29%	17	71%	0	0%
Privileged	22	96%	1	4%	0	0%

Recommendations from Teachers and Administrators

One of the most important questions included in the questionnaire for teachers and administrators was the request that they indicate the three recommendations they felt would be most helpful for improvement of disadvantaged youth. Tables 58, 59, 60, and 61 summarize this information. Reduced class size was chosen by all of the teachers' groups and the administrative groups in all of the comparison areas. With few exceptions, improved reading and writing achievement of students was also chosen consistently. Among the recommendations receiving the least proportion of choices was that of paying teachers more in culturally disadvantaged areas.

Table 58

Recommendations from Elementary Teachers
in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

Recommendation	Avalon		Boyle Heights		Compton etc.		East Los Angeles		Watts		Privileged	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reduce class size	218	84%	108	90%	507	81%	200	93%	93	90%	196	93%
Provide added educ. or voc. counseling	65	24%	23	18%	168	27%	56	27%	69	30%	93	45%
Pay teachers more	83	33%	16	12%	213	33%	36	18%	56	27%	41	21%
Increase instructional materials	118	45%	59	48%	253	39%	128	60%	93	42%	133	63%
Improve reading and writing	91	36%	67	57%	244	39%	114	54%	68	33%	50	24%
Provide social workers	43	18%	14	12%	135	21%	26	12%	41	18%	17	9%
Provide separate classes for discip. problems	71	27%	24	21%	139	21%	23	12%	48	21%	79	39%
Increase parent concern	86	33%	51	42%	243	39%	66	30%	84	39%	20	9%

Table 59

Recommendations from Secondary Teachers in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

Recommendation	Avalon		Boyle Heights		Compton etc.		East Los Angeles		Watts		Privi-leged	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reduce class size	182	72%	261	69%	276	78%	190	72%	204	87%	276	90%
Provide added educ. or voc. counseling	59	24%	68	18%	100	30%	55	21%	60	27%	85	27%
Pay teachers more	80	30%	88	24%	83	24%	55	21%	99	42%	89	30%
Increase instructional materials	108	42%	136	36%	94	27%	90	33%	67	30%	140	45%
Improve reading and writing	139	54%	246	66%	216	63%	167	63%	136	57%	161	51%
Provide social workers	26	9%	34	9%	30	9%	26	9%	17	6%	25	9%
Provide separate classes for discip. problems	61	24%	121	33%	124	36%	82	30%	62	27%	99	33%
Increase parent concern	113	45%	181	48%	129	36%	140	51%	60	27%	58	18%

Table 60

Recommendations from Special Teachers
in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

Recommendation	Avalon		Boyle Heights		Compton etc.		East Los Angeles		Watts		Privileged	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reduce class size	55	69%	57	75%	57	63%	63	69%	63	81%	33	96%
Provide added educ. or voc. counseling	28	36%	23	30%	33	36%	29	30%	27	33%	16	45%
Pay teachers more	33	42%	19	24%	28	33%	21	24%	16	21%	6	18%
Increase instructional materials	24	30%	29	39%	23	27%	38	42%	31	39%	18	51%
Improve reading and writing	30	39%	48	63%	48	54%	47	51%	27	33%	14	39%
Provide social workers	16	21%	9	12%	18	21%	12	12%	16	21%	3	9%
Provide separate classes for discip. problems	20	24%	16	21%	25	27%	27	30%	19	24%	9	27%
Increase parent concern	32	39%	31	39%	34	39%	40	42%	38	48%	5	15%

Table 61

Recommendations from Administrators
in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

Recommendation	Avalon		Boyle Heights		Compton etc.		East Los Angeles		Watts		Privileged	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reduce class size	38	84%	17	72%	47	87%	14	78%	19	78%	23	90%
Provide added educ. or voc. counseling	9	21%	7	30%	15	27%	7	39%	13	54%	8	33%
Pay teachers more	28	60%	3	12%	6	12%	2	12%	0	0%	12	48%
Increase instructional materials	5	12%	2	9%	9	18%	6	33%	5	21%	15	60%
Improve reading and writing	20	45%	15	63%	31	57%	10	57%	15	63%	8	33%
Provide social workers	6	12%	5	21%	27	51%	2	12%	8	33%	3	12%
Provide separate classes for discip. problems	11	24%	6	24%	7	12%	3	18%	4	18%	6	24%
Increase parent concern	21	45%	17	72%	18	33%	10	57%	8	33%	1	3%

Parents' View of the Schools

The information from the parents is summarized in the attached tables. It is not claimed that this is a typical group of parents nor a cross section of parents in the areas studied. However, in view of the fact that there are only twenty parents interviewed in each of the areas, percentages are not used in the tables as these might be misleading. The level of education of respondents in the disadvantaged areas is higher than is probably typical of a cross section of adults in these communities. Nevertheless, there is still a consistently higher level of education in the advantaged areas.

For the most part, the respondents to the questionnaire were the mothers of children in school (Table 62). Most of the families resided in the city of Los Angeles eleven or more years.

Table 62

Family Position of Respondent to Parent Interview-Questionnaire

District	Mother	Father	Sis.	Bro.	Uncle	Aunt	Grand-father	Grand-mother
Avalon	16	0	3	1	0	0	0	0
Boyle Heights	11	3	4	1	0	0	0	1
Compton, etc.	12	2	3	1	0	0	0	1
East Los Angeles	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	1
Watts	13	2	1	2	0	0	0	2
Privileged	15	1	0	1	1	0	0	1

Table 63 shows no major differences in the length of time students have been in their present school between the advantaged and disadvantaged areas. Clearly, the respondents are not typical of parents in disadvantaged areas. It is likely their opinions represent the more stable residents of these areas. Nevertheless, reporting the attitude toward the schools from this number of parents seemed valuable in view of the scarcity of direct information on a systematic basis from such parents.

Table 63

Number of Years Children Have Been in Present School

District	Less than 1 Yr.	1 Yr.	2 Yrs.	3 Yrs.	4 Yrs.	5 Yrs.	6 or More
Avalon	2	1	5	7	1	2	2
Boyle Heights	0	1	0	3	5	4	9
Compton, etc.	1	6	8	6	6	2	6
East Los Angeles	0	0	7	4	3	3	3
Watts	2	6	9	3	4	1	55
Privileged	0	1	0	5	2	4	9

Table 64 shows that many more schools have been attended by children in the disadvantaged areas than in the advantaged areas.

Table 64

Number of Other Schools Children Have Attended

District	0 Schools	1 School	2 Schools	3 Schools	4 to 6 Schools	7 or more Schools
Avalon	4	9	2	3	2	0
Boyle Heights	2	4	9	4	1	0
Compton, etc.	3	1	6	2	3	0
East Los Angeles	10	2	4	2	0	0
Watts	7	5	2	6	0	0
Privileged	9	6	5	0	0	0

More parents in the advantaged areas answered "Yes" to the question, "Have you been in any of the schools your children are attending during the past year?"

Table 65

Visits by Parents to Schools Children Are Attending

District	Have you been in any of the schools your children are attending during the past year? Yes	No
Avalon	17	4
Boyle Heights	16	4
Compton, etc.	18	1
East Los Angeles	16	4
Watts	16	4
Privileged	19	1

When the question was asked of the parents, "Do you feel that most of the teachers treat your child fairly?" Avalon, Boyle Heights, Watts and the privileged area showed a heavy proportion answering, "Always." A large proportion of parents in East Los Angeles and in Compton answered this question, "Usually." Apart from this, there seems to be no significant difference in the parents' view of their children's treatment at school.

Table 66

Attitude of Parents toward Treatment of Child in School

District	Do you feel that most of the teachers treat your child fairly? Never	Seldom	Usually	Always
Avalon	0	1	8	11
Boyle Heights	0	0	2	18
Compton, etc.	0	1	16	1
East Los Angeles	0	1	11	8
Watts	0	0	9	11
Privileged	0	0	5	14

To the question, "Do you feel the schools teach your children to read well?" a substantial majority of the parents in all five of the areas of Los Angeles answered, "Yes." In Boyle Heights all of the parents interviewed said, "Yes."

In the County area, however, where the elementary parents came from the Willowbrook School District, two-thirds of the parents said, "No," their children do not read well. This information is included in Table 67.

Table 67

Attitude of Parents toward Reading Program in School

District	Do you feel the schools teach your children to read well? Yes	No
Avalon	16	4
Boyle Heights	20	0
Compton, etc.	6	13
East Los Angeles	17	3
Watts	13	7
Privileged	15	5

When the parents were asked, "Do you think the schools are better, not as good as they were 5 years ago, or about the same as 5 years ago?" a majority indicated they were either better than 5 years ago, or about the same as 5 years ago. This is summarized in Table 68.

Table 68

Parents' Evaluation of the Schools

District	Better than 5 years ago	About the same as 5 years ago	Not as good as 5 years ago
Avalon	9	10	1
Boyle Heights	12	6	1
Compton, etc.	6	12	0
East Los Angeles	17	2	1
Watts	5	11	4
Privileged	10	9	1

When the parents were asked their view of the competence of the teachers their children now have, only one parent in Compton and one parent in Avalon indicated the teaching was poor or below average. There appears to be no appreciable difference in this respect between the advantaged and disadvantaged areas. An exception to this generalization is that no parent in the Compton area rated a teacher as excellent, and a smaller number in Compton than in any other area rated their teachers as good. (See Table 69.)

Table 69

Parents' Evaluation of the Teachers

District	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
Avalon	2	7	10	0	1
Boyle Heights	8	7	5	0	0
Compton, etc.	0	3	13	0	1
East Los Angeles	5	11	4	0	0
Watts	2	8	10	0	0
Privileged	4	9	7	0	0

Tables 70 and 71 show the results of questions about the PTA. A much larger number of the parents interviewed belong to the PTA in the advantaged area than in the disadvantaged area. Of those who do not belong, a large number in East Los Angeles and Boyle Heights said that they would not join the PTA if asked. It is possible that the language barrier to communication should be examined more carefully by the PTA's in the Mexican-American area.

Table 70

Parents' Participation in PTA

District	Do you belong to the PTA?	
	Yes	No
Avalon	9	11
Boyle Heights	9	11
Compton, etc.	16	3
East Los Angeles	10	10
Watts	14	6
Privileged	19	1

Table 71

Parents' Attitude toward PTA

District	Would you join the PTA if asked?	
	Yes	No
Avalon	9	2
Boyle Heights	3	7
Compton, etc.	2	1
East Los Angeles	0	10
Watts	5	1
Privileged	1	0

Summary of Questionnaires

Generally, the information from the classroom teachers and from the principals regarding the preparation and experience of teachers, classroom size and of employment status corroborates the data received from the Personnel and Business offices of the Board of Education. In addition, the untabulated, open-end questions on suggestions and recommendations for improvement have communicated a strong feeling for reduction in class size and improved reading and language achievement. When this information is added to the strong rating given by teachers in all of the areas to the "reduce class size" and to the "improve students' reading and writing achievement," it is clear that a major effort in this direction would receive hearty support of the professional staff.

SECTION IV

NEW OPPORTUNITIES, PROVISIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

New Opportunities and Provisions for Improvement in the Education of Disadvantaged Youth

Los Angeles

The Los Angeles City schools appointed a Director of Urban Affairs two years ago. Through this office much of the work of the schools in the disadvantaged areas has been coordinated. The office issues a yearly report on the new activities and new programs designed to increase the educational opportunities and achievements of culturally disadvantaged youth. A report issued October 20, 1965, in Spotlight, the Los Angeles City schools employees' newsletter, summarizes this work very appropriately. This material is accurate and up to date and so is included in its entirety here:

> Thirteen anti-poverty projects affecting more than 84,000 students are being conducted this year in Los Angeles. The programs, ranging from extended day school to a reception room program designed to orient students new to the district, are being financed primarily with a $4.4 million federal Economic Opportunity Act grant. The special projects are being held at 98 elementary schools, 11 adult schools, nine senior high schools and 10 junior high schools. In most instances the school programs are a continuation and expansion of programs which were started last February with a $973,799 federal grant.
>
> THE PROJECTS
>
> Pre-School Classes ($792,912)--A program providing classes in 30 schools for 4-year-old children, supplying them with experiences and motivation to achieve school success. Approximately 720 children will participate.
>
> Extended Day School ($680,303)--This program, at 95 schools at the elementary level, will concentrate on remedial work in reading to provide children with better opportunities to succeed in their academic program. They will meet in small classes for half-hour periods, both before and after regular school hours. Approximately 19,000 children will participate in this program.

Saturday School ($386,596)--Special programs will be conducted in 45 elementary schools on Saturdays for children selected by teachers of the regular school. Emphasis will be on instruction in remedial reading, arithmetic improvement, language arts, use of library--as well as assistance with homework concepts through individual tutoring. School playgrounds and libraries also will be maintained for use of children. Approximately 10,800 children will participate.

Group Counseling ($456,767)--A program designed to provide help through group counseling services, to students who are potential dropouts or have educational problems. Ten junior and senior high schools will be assigned extra counselors, with approximately 2000 students to be assisted.

Student Achievement Center ($774,162)--A program designed to provide several specialized reading teachers to schools having a large number of children in areas of poverty. About 2,300 teachers will participate at seven centers.

Parent-Child Pre-School Classes ($175,690)--An adult education program to help mothers develop attitudes and skills that will enable them to guide and motivate their children. Approximately 2,360 children and their mothers will participate in this program at 20 locations.

Guidance, Counseling and Testing ($229,857)--Another adult education program to provide adequate and convenient counseling services for the chronically displaced worker, the low productive worker, dropouts, and those adults with a variety of problems that hinder their employability. Full time counselors will be assigned to 10 adult schools, which serve an estimated 39,660 people.

Home Management ($158,157)--Classes will be conducted in 25 locations --including housing projects and settlement houses--to provide homemakers in areas of poverty with instruction in family budgetary procedures, installment buying, nutrition, consumer information on adequate clothing and food purchasing, improving existing housing accommodations, sanitary procedures, and use of various cleaning and refurnishing materials.

Gerontology ($88,132)--Classes for senior citizens in 25 locations will present adequate and factual information on community participation, financial management, nutrition, mental and physical health, housing, and employment opportunities.

Reception Room ($491,554)--Special counseling services at 10 schools which gather complete educational data about students new to the district, help orient the students, and advise their parents about the assistance available to them in the school and community.

School Opportunity Center ($388,345)--Provides accelerated schooling in reading, science, music, art, mathematics and industrial arts for junior and senior high school students before and after school and on Saturdays. Seven schools will serve 4,000 students in the program.

Parent-School Coordination ($76,353)--Special classes at 25 schools and community locations will help parents understand and assist with the educational program their youngsters are taking at school. More than 375 parents are expected to participate at 25 sites.

English for Foreign Speaking ($68,627)--English instruction for foreign speaking adult professionals will be held at the International Institute of Los Angeles for 120 people.

There are additional programs in the Los Angeles City public schools; a summary of these, provided by the Director of Urban Affairs, is included in the appendix. All of the federal and state resources for such programs have been utilized to some extent. Apparently the Los Angeles City schools are taking an active and effective part in obtaining and using funds from the various state and federal sources to improve the education of the culturally disadvantaged. Although the total amount of money looks at first glance to be large, when it is spread over the number of students and number of programs now under way, it should be obvious to even the casual reviewer that it is only a beginning.

Other Studies and Other Cities

Professor Kenneth Clark and many others have made a number of recommendations and suggestions for improvement of the culturally disadvantaged. So far as we are able to determine, all of these are being tried to some extent within the Los Angeles City schools, except those recommendations dealing with added pay for teachers in disadvantaged areas.

Among the most helpful suggestions are those made by a number of the residents in Watts who testified before the Industrial Relations Committee of the California State Assembly. This committee, chaired by Assemblyman Mervyn Dymally, held hearings in the Watts area early this fall. The suggestions made by the residents have influenced this report.

The recommendations of Professor John Kenneth Galbraith and the recommendations of the Committee on Economic Development indicate that much more massive concentration of money and effort is required than we are now providing. The present programs in most cities are not intensive enough to make the major change in academic achievement that is necessary. Unless a large majority of students in disadvantaged areas learn to read and write no matter what the cost before they enter the fifth grade, the anti-poverty war will be lost. While helpful, the many programs to patch up, or remedy the educational achievement of functional illiterates cannot solve the basic problem of bringing these people into the mainstream of communication with society.

Another source of recommendations is new programs being tried in other cities. Several references have been made to the Banaker project in St. Louis. Unfortunately, we were unable to obtain first-hand observation of this program.

Detroit schools have launched during the past four or five years a number of programs to aid the culturally disadvantaged. The most notable of these is the community agent program for each of the 27,"greater cities" schools. A non-school person is assigned to work with the community to develop after-school programs with adults; to establish a community link between the Board of Education and parents, adults, various community and civic agencies, but particularly the schools. A number of important improvements have been made in schools in the disadvantaged area because of the community agents. In many cases problems that might have festered and become open sores have been treated at an earlier, less serious stage.

In New York City several programs have been attempted for improvement in the education of the disadvantaged. The most effective of these is a program called "More Effective Schools." This program is designed essentially to provide the best possible learning situation for the student and teaching situation for the teacher that present knowledge of learning and teaching can devise. It accepts the recommendations of Clark and the Committee on Economic Development. It is effective so far in three major respects:

1) Those children who are in the program for the second year are now improving their reading at a rate faster than the norm. Anyone familiar with the major problems in reading achievement in culturally disadvantaged areas knows how important and difficult this is.

2) Experienced, competent teachers from other parts of the city are applying for assignment to these schools in disadvantaged areas. Several principals reported that they have at least two experienced, highly qualified applicants for every opening in their building. This is phenomenal for schools in a disadvantaged area today.

3) Although parents are receiving increased attention through the educational thrust of the schools, those aspects of the child's education that are normally provided in the informal atmospheres of the family in middle class and advantaged areas are being provided by the schools for children in the disadvantaged areas.

Because considerable emphasis has been put in the recommendations in this report on the More Effective Schools program, a summary of that program is included in the appendix. It should be pointed out that while much of the Higher Horizons program that has received much publicity in New York has been essentially abandoned, the More Effective Schools program has been increased in scope.

I have talked to teachers in the pre-school, primary, and upper grades in New York. I have talked to teachers in the classroom, in the school, and away from the school. In every instance they are enthusiastic about this work. I believe the concentration of effort at the earliest possible age in developing good reading and language skills of these students by providing the optimum teaching and learning situation for the teacher and the student is the most fruitful possibility for breaking the vicious cycle of unstable family, poor education, poor jobs, more welfare, more delinquency, amd more unstable families. Without such changes, the schools in the disadvantaged areas do not provide a program that meets the unequal educational needs of culturally disadvantaged children. Although special remedial programs are offered in an attempt to compensate for deficiencies in learning, the basic organization and orientation of schools is the same in advantaged and disadvantaged areas. The same educational program for children of unequal background does not provide an equal opportunity for children to learn.

Recommendations for Improvement in the Education of Disadvantaged Youth

A massive attack on the most basic educational problem of disadvantaged areas is needed. Nothing less, in the long run, is either practical or likely to succeed. The basic problem is literacy. A majority of students leave the primary grades unable to read, write, and use language skills. A concentration of money and effort must be made on pre-school and primary grade children to make this major improvement in their reading and writing achievement.

Most of those who drop out, who are delinquent, who are unemployed, who are ineffective in providing minimum family security, are illiterate. The behavior problems, the guidance problems, the remedial reading problems, the vocational education problems, the family education problems, and the school-community problems all revolve around language deficiency. The medium for exchange of ideas, for communication, and for participation in society today is reading, writing, and language skill. Without this there is no medium of personal exchange. Not to be able to read a newspaper, not to have a common background of cultural knowledge, not to be able to participate in the exchange of ideas, and not to have the communication skills necessary for vocational retraining, is to be one of the socially, culturally, and economically disadvantaged.

It is folly to spend money--as we are doing throughout the country today in junior high and high school classes in history, English, government, and literature--on students whom we have not taught to read and write. One reason for concentrating on pre-school and primary school children's language skills is the fact that when children have passed the primary years the number who are effectively helped by remedial instruction, dropout programs, vocational guidance, etc., is a very small proportion of all those who need such help.

Those who have had experience with, or studied, the problem of education in the disadvantaged areas have acknowledged that lack of reading, writing, and language proficiency is basic to the other problems. Kenneth Clark, Professor John Kenneth Galbraith, James Conant, The Committee for Economic Development, the teachers in the Los Angeles Districts, the principals in Los Angeles, and the teachers in New York, St. Louis, and Detroit all emphasize reading, writing, and language skills as basic. Certainly the data from this study showing average achievement in reading and writing skills at the 12th and 21st percentile confirm that present provisions are inadequate. Something drastic, immediate, and massive must be done.

How Can This Problem Be Attacked?

The New York More Effective Schools program is one such approach. The recommendation of the teachers in the survey made by the Los Angeles Teachers Association is another approach. Both have three important aspects in common:

1) Effort is concentrated on young children, particularly pre-school and primary grades.

2) Emphasis is on drastic reduction in class size and increase in the availability of instructional materials.

3) Special services and classes, particularly for the emotionally and socially disturbed, are recommended.

Adoption of such a program is expensive. However, the expense--in the long run--is much less than a projection of present welfare, unemployment, and delinquency costs, even if human considerations are ignored.

What Can Be Done for Students beyond the Early Elementary Years?

Assume that a massive attack will be made on this basic problem of the development of language skills for pre-school and primary age children. Assume that, in the next generation, such a program will be a proved success. What can be done for older students now?

Continuation of the many projects already started in the Los Angeles City Schools is appropriate. These projects include the Extended Day and Saturday School with its concentration on remedial reading, Group Counseling, Student Achievement Centers, Home Management Classes, Reception Rooms, Opportunity Centers, Parent-School Coordination Classes, Social Adjustment Classes, Reading Improvement Project, Special Training Program, Special Classes for Non-English Speaking and Foreign Students, Summer Study Center, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the Job Corps. While such projects are unlikely to solve the fundamental educational problem, they can buy time for us to concentrate on the real enemy--illiteracy.

LIST OF APPENDICES

List of Schools in Comparison Area Study A1

Test Data and Report Submitted by Los Angeles City Schools A3

Increase in Pupil Enrollment in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles . . . A6

Data on Class Size and Transiency A7

Maintenance of School Plants A22

Equipment Rehabilitation Schedule in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles . A24

Average Number of Acres Per Site in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles . A24

Total Valuation of Equipment as of June 30, 1965 in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles A25

Assembly Facilities in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles A25

Capital Outlay for Comparison Areas of Los Angeles A26

Transportation of Pupils A27

Report on School Lunch Program A30

Los Angeles Secondary School Libraries A31

Los Angeles Elementary School Libraries A33

Audio Visual Services in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles A37

Allocation of Textbook Expenditures, Junior High Schools, 1964-65 . . A37a

Allocation of Textbook Expenditures, Senior High Schools, 1964-65 . . A37b

Special Programs of Education in Secondary Schools of Comparison Areas of Los Angeles A38

Distribution of Questionnaires A39

Teacher and Administrator Questionnaire Returns by Comparison Area . . A41

Summary of Los Angeles School Districts Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged (Prepared by the Office of Urban Affairs) A42

More Effective Schools Program A52

Letter from Los Angeles Teachers Association A66

Information from President AFT L.A. Chapter A67

Schools in Comparison Area Study

Poverty Area - Avalon District

Elementary Schools

- Ascot Avenue
- Forty-Ninth Street
- Holmes Avenue
- Hooper Avenue
- Main Street
- Nevin Avenue
- Trinity Street
- Wadsworth
- West Vernon

Junior High Schools

- Carver

Senior High Schools

- Jefferson
- *Manual Arts

Poverty Area - Boyle Heights District

Elementary Schools

- Albion Street
- Breed Street
- Bridge Street
- Dacotah Street
- Euclid Avenue
- Evergreen Avenue
- First Street
- Gates Street
- Glen Alta School
- Griffin Avenue
- Hillside School
- Huntington Drive
- Latona Avenue
- Lorena Street
- Malabar Street
- Murchison Street
- Sheridan Street
- Soto Street

Junior High Schools

- Hollenbeck
- *Nightingale
- Stevenson

Senior High Schools

- Lincoln
- Roosevelt

*Schools adjacent to poverty areas.

Poverty Area - East Los Angeles District

Elementary Schools

Belvedere School
Brooklyn Avenue
City Terrace School
Eastman Avenue
Ford Boulevard
Fourth Street
Hammel Street
Harrison Street
Humphreys Avenue
Lane School
Marianna Avenue
McDonnell Avenue
Riggin Avenue
Rowan Avenue

Junior High Schools

Belvedere
Griffith

Senior High Schools

Garfield

Poverty Area - Watts District

Elementary Schools *

Avalon Gardens
Compton Avenue
Grape Street
Ritter School
Weigand Avenue
Ninety-Third Street
Ninety-Sixth Street
Ninety-Ninth Street
One Hundred Second
One Hundred Seventh
One Hundred Ninth
One Hundred Eleventh
One Hundred Twelfth
One Hundred Sixteenth
One Hundred Eighteenth
One Hundred Twenty-Second

Junior High Schools

Gompers
Markham

Senior High Schools

Jordan

*Schools adjacent to poverty areas.

Economically Privileged Study Area

Elementary Schools

Bellagio
Brentwood
Brockton
Canyon
Fairburn
Kenter
Marquez
Nora Sterry
Palisades
Roscomare
Warner
Westwood

Junior High Schools

Emerson
Revere

Senior High Schools

Palisades
University

Test Data and Report Submitted by Los Angeles City Schools

Attached to this memorandum will be found the test data requested by Dr. Kenneth Martyn in connection with his investigation of the Los Angeles City Schools on behalf of the McCone Commission.

Because of the nature of the request, and because of the peculiar groupings of schools employed (i.e., groupings which do not correspond to our usual areas), it was necessary to do a substantial amount of hand work, and to make some judgments as to how the data were to be handled. I want to explain these matters so that there can be no question as to the accuracy of what we are submitting.

1. Grades chosen. Dr. Martyn had agreed that data arising from testing done as a part of the mandatory State Testing Program would be satisfactory. That program included grades five, eight, and eleven. However, another problem arose, which had to do with whether we would submit data for the "B" grades, the "A" grades, or both.

Our conclusion was that we should submit data only for the "B" grades, for a number of reasons. The first was that these grades (i.e., B5, B8, and B11) were the large grade groups in the fall semester, when the tests were administered. Grade B5 included 68% of all fifth grade pupils, grade B8, 70% of all eighth grade pupils, and grade B11, 73% of all eleventh grade pupils.

A second reason was that in terms of city-wide average ability (I.Q.), these grades were all very close to I.Q. = 100, which is the theoretical national average. A third reason was that these grades, in our semi-annual promotion system, correspond to the full grades of an annual promotion system. Most U. S. school systems are on annual promotion. Therefore, to the degree that we have transient pupils, these will almost always be in the fall semester "B" groups. In short, we considered the "B" grades to be the more representative, and used them.

2. Treatment of the Data. Normally we interpret data for large groups in terms of medians. However, here we were faced with the necessity of combining data for schools. To do this we had to multiply the mean score for each school by the number of pupils tested, sum these for all schools in each group, and compute a new mean for the group. These mean scores were then interpreted in terms of the test publisher's percentile norms, so that our final table shows the percentile equivalent, on a national basis, of the mean score for the group. It should be noted, however, that differences between mean and median scores in distributions of the numbers of cases involved here are quite small.

3. Interpolation of Percentiles. Publishers' norms are generally intended for the interpretation of large group averages. Pupil scores can only be in whole-number values, whereas group averages are almost always whole numbers plus decimal fractions. Norm tables in test manuals provide

percentile equivalents for whole number value scores. For example, here is an excerpt from the norm table for the California Achievement Test, elementary:

Percentile Equivalent	Reading Vocabulary Raw Score
24	23
21	22
18	20-21
16	19

Of the six average scores that had to be assigned percentile equivalents, four were in this range. They were 21.61, 19.97, 20.54, and 21.86. In order to assign these percentile equivalents, it was necessary, then, to interpolate values for percentiles which lay between those shown on the table. For example, the equivalent for the raw score 21.61 lies between the 18th and 21st percentiles, and has been given a value of 20 on the percentile scale.

It is hoped that these explanations of decisions that had to be made are sufficient to indicate that the data shown are an accurate portrayal of the relative standings of the several groups.

Following are the names of tests used to derive the data shown on the page of tabular material:

Grade B5

Intelligence: California Test of Mental Maturity, Elementary Level, '57 S Form
Achievement: California Achievement Test, Elementary, Form W

This test contains the following sub-tests: Reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, arithmetic reasoning, arithmetic fundamentals, mechanics of English, and spelling.

Group B8

Intelligence: California Test of Mental Maturity, Junior high level, '57 S Form
Achievement: California Achievement Test, Junior high, Form W

This test contains sub-tests titled similarly to those shown for Grade B5.

Grade B11

Intelligence: Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability, Revised, Grades 9 - 12, Form A.
Achievement: Cooperative English Tests, 1960, Form 2A

This test contains the following sub-tests: Reading vocabulary, level of reading comprehension, and English expression.

Iowa Tests of Educational Development, Form X-3S (class period version), Test 4 only, "Quantitative Thinking"

Increase in Pupil Enrollment in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

	Overall Pupil Increase 1960-1965	Overall Increase Teaching Personnel 1960-1965 (Present Norm)
Avalon Area	763	23
Boyle Heights Area	1,424	42
East Los Angeles Area	836	25
Watts Area	2,294	68
Economically Privileged Area	Drop of 171 since 1960	Decrease of 6

These figures are not defined in more particular terms, which would include increase in EMR pupils or in allocation of special reserve positions to a school.

Data on Class Size and Transiency

INFORMATION ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF SIZES OF CLASSES FOR THE VARIOUS STUDY AREAS HAS BEEN DEVELOPED ON AN ORGANIZATIONAL BASIS, I.E., STUDIES OF THE KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM, GRADES ONE THROUGH SIX, AND SUBJECT AREAS WITHIN THE JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS.

ACTIONS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION AFFECT ALL SCHOOLS REGARDLESS OF AREA. POLICIES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION REVEAL THAT THE PUPIL TEACHER RATIO IS DETERMINED BY "NORMS". THE BASIS FOR THE ALLOTMENT OF CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL TO SCHOOLS IS ACCOMPLISHED BY A SERIES OF NORM TABLES. THE TABLES PROVIDE FOR TEACHER ALLOTMENT IN GRADES 1-3 ON THE BASIS OF 33.0 PUPILS PER TEACHER, AND 34.5 FOR KINDERGARTEN AND GRADES 4-6. SCHOOLS ARE CONSIDERED ON THE NORM IF THE ENROLLMENT OF EACH CLASS DECLINES TO NOT LESS THAN 6 BELOW THE MINIMUM OF THE APPROPRIATE RANGE. THESE TABLES ARE BASED UPON THE PROVISIONS OF ASSEMBLY BILL 145 OF THE 1964 SPECIAL SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE AND WILL BE CHANGED ANNUALLY IN ORDER TO CONTINUE TO MEET THE PROVISIONS OF THIS LEGISLATION.

THE BASIS FOR ALLOTMENT OF TEACHERS TO JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IS ALSO ACCOMPLISHED BY NORM TABLES. THESE TABLES ARE COMPUTED ON THE BASIS OF 28.5 PUPILS PER TEACHER, ALLOWING A PERIOD OF PREPARATION FOR FIVE PERIODS OF TEACHING.

ADDITIONAL "OFF-NORM" POSITIONS HAVE BEEN ADDED OVER THE YEARS TO STRENGTHEN CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM. THESE POSITIONS ARE SPECIFICALLY SET FORTH IN POLICY STATEMENTS OF THE BOARD.

THE FOLLOWING TABLES DEMONSTRATE THE EFFECT SUCH POLICIES HAVE HAD ON THE SIZE OF CLASSES WITHIN THE SCHOOLS. INCLUDED IN THE SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION ARE POLICY STATEMENTS OF THE BOARD WITH REGARD TO THE ALLOTMENT OF CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL TO THE SCHOOLS.

IT WOULD APPEAR FROM THE ANALYSIS THAT ALL SCHOOLS IN THE STUDY AREAS ARE IN A MORE ADVANTAGEOUS POSITION THAN THE DISTRICT AT LARGE.

TRANSIENCY FACTORS ARE HIGHER FOR THE DISADVANTAGED AREAS THAN FOR THE DISTRICT IN GENERAL. IT IS DIFFICULT TO PROVIDE A CONTINUOUS EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR TRANSIENT PUPILS. LONG RANGE PLANNING BECOMES EXCEEDINGLY DIFFICULT FOR A HIGHLY MOBILE STUDENT POPULATION. IT IS TO BE NOTED, HOWEVER, IN THE STATEMENTS OF BOARD POLICY THAT STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN IN THE DIRECTION OF COMPENSATING FOR SUCH PROBLEMS.

NATIONALLY THERE IS CONCERN FOR THE PROBLEM OF THE DROPOUT. IT IS TO BE NOTED, HOWEVER, THAT THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION HAS RECOGNIZED LOS ANGELES AS HAVING ONE OF THE LOWEST DROPOUT RATES IN THE NATION. IT IS THEREFORE CONCLUDED THAT THE "HOLDING POWER" OF LOS ANGELES SCHOOLS EXCEEDS THAT OF THE NATION.

BUDGET DIVISION
OCTOBER 7, 1965

DISTRIBUTION OF KINDERGARDEN CLASSES BY INDIVIDUAL CLASS

CLASS SIZE	TOTAL DISTRICT		PRIVILEGED AREA		AVALON DISTRICT		BOYLE HEIGHTS DIST.		EAST L. A. DIST.		WATTS DISTRICT	
	CLASSES	% TOTAL	CLASSES	% TOTAL	CLASSES	% TOTAL	CLASSES	% TOTAL	CLASSES	% TOTAL	CLASSES	% TOTAL
13 & UNDER	30	1.41	2	4.44	-	-	3	3.66	5	5.95	1	1.05
14	12	.57	-	-	1	1.69	1	1.22	2	2.38	-	-
15	10	.47	-	-	-	-	1	1.22	1	1.19	-	-
16	12	.57	2	4.45	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	25	1.18	2	4.45	-	-	1	1.22	2	2.38	-	-
18	29	1.37	3	6.67	-	-	2	2.44	-	-	-	-
19	39	1.84	2	4.45	-	-	2	2.44	1	1.19	-	-
20	61	2.88	3	6.67	2	3.39	2	2.44	1	1.19	-	-
21	78	3.69	4	8.88	2	3.39	3	3.66	2	2.38	5	5.26
22	119	5.62	3	6.67	4	6.78	3	3.66	3	3.57	9	9.48
23	131	6.19	1	2.22	8	13.56	4	4.88	2	2.38	1	1.05
24	222	10.49	2	4.45	7	11.86	5	6.10	9	10.71	8	8.42
25	263	12.42	3	6.67	6	10.17	10	12.19	12	14.29	8	8.42
26	327	15.45	7	15.54	17	28.81	12	14.63	14	16.67	11	11.58
27	264	12.47	6	13.33	5	8.48	12	14.63	12	14.29	17	17.89
28	232	10.96	3	6.67	5	8.48	8	9.76	11	13.10	18	18.95
29	138	6.52	1	2.22	2	3.39	9	10.97	6	7.14	8	8.42
30	81	3.83	1	2.22	-	-	3	3.66	1	1.19	9	9.48
31	21	.99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	10	.47	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
33	7	.33	-	-	-	-	1	1.22	-	-	-	-
34	2	.09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
35	3	.14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
36	1	.05	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	2,117	100%	45	100%	59	100%	82	100%	84	100%	95	100%

SIZE OF CLASSES AND NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
AS OF SECOND SCHOOL MONTH OF 964-65

	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	TOTAL NO. OF TEACHERS	1-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45 & OVER	NON-REGISTER
TOTAL DISTRICT												
NUMBER (ALL SCHOOLS & CLASSES)	302,323	10,009	48	168	604	75	525	5,047	3,084	23	-	435
PER CENT OF TOTAL		100.	.48	1.68	6.03	.75	5.25	50.42	30.81	.23	-	4.35
LESS:												
PHYS. HANDI. SCHOOLS		292	46	50	48	25	2	1	1	-	-	119
SPECIAL TRAINING - EMR CLASSES		605	1	56	548	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT CLASSES		67	1	59	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NUMBER (REGULAR SCHOOLS & CLASSES)		9,045	-	3	1	50	523	5,046	3,083	23	-	316
PER CENT OF TOTAL		100.	-	.03	.01	.55	5.78	55.79	34.09	.26	-	3.49
AVALON DISTRICT												
NUMBER (ALL SCHOOLS & CLASSES)	8,124	289	1	6	42	-	25	140	60	-	-	15
PER CENT OF TOTAL		100.	.35	2.08	14.53	-	8.65	48.44	20.76	-	-	5.19
LESS:												
SPECIAL TRAINING-EMR CLASSES		47	-	5	42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT CLASSES		2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NUMBER (REGULAR SCHOOLS & CLASSES)		240	-	-	-	-	25	140	60	-	-	15
PER CENT OF TOTAL		100.	-	-	-	-	10.42	58.33	25.00	-	-	6.25
BOYLE HEIGHTS DISTRICT												
NUMBER (ALL SCHOOLS & CLASSES)	11,518	390	-	5	43	1	17	206	99	1	-	18
PER CENT OF TOTAL		100.	-	1.28	11.03	.26	4.36	52.82	25.38	.26	-	4.61
LESS:												
SPECIAL TRAINING-EMR CLASSES		46	-	4	42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT CLASSES		2	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NUMBER (REGULAR SCHOOLS & CLASSES)		342	-	-	-	1	17	206	99	1	-	18
PER CENT OF TOTAL		100.	-	-	-	.29	4.97	60.24	28.95	.29	-	5.26
EAST LOS ANGELES DISTRICT												
NUMBER (ALL SCHOOLS & CLASSES)	11,675	400	-	7	47	3	17	181	118	1	-	26
PER CENT OF TOTAL		100.	-	1.75	11.75	.75	4.25	45.25	29.50	.25	-	6.50
LESS:												
SPECIAL TRAINING-EMR CLASSES		48	-	3	45	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT CLASSES		6	-	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NUMBER (REGULAR SCHOOLS & CLASSES)		346	-	-	-	3	17	181	118	1	-	26
PER CENT OF TOTAL		100.	-	-	-	.87	4.91	52.31	34.11	.29	-	7.51
WATTS DISTRICT												
NUMBER (ALL SCHOOLS & CLASSES)	15,308	542	-	18	85	2	83	236	102	-	-	16
PER CENT OF TOTAL		100.	-	3.32	15.68	.37	15.32	43.54	18.82	-	-	2.95
LESS:												
SPECIAL TRAINING-EMR CLASSES		94	-	10	84	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT CLASSES		7	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NUMBER (REGULAR SCHOOLS & CLASSES)		441	-	1	1	2	83	236	102	-	-	16
PER CENT OF TOTAL		100.	-	.23	.23	.45	18.82	53.51	23.13	-	-	3.63
ECONOMICALLY PRIVILEGED AREA												
NUMBER (ALL SCHOOLS & CLASSES)	7,086	223	-	3	6	1	5	117	80	1	-	10
PER CENT OF TOTAL		100.	-	1.35	2.69	.45	2.24	52.47	35.87	.45	-	4.48
LESS:												
SPECIAL TRAINING-EMR CLASSES		8	-	2	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT CLASSES		1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NUMBER (REGULAR SCHOOLS & CLASSES)		214	-	-	-	1	5	117	80	1	-	10
PER CENT OF TOTAL		100	-	-	-	.47	2.34	54.67	37.38	.47	-	4.67

BUDGET DIVISION
OCTOBER 4, 1965

BUDGET DIVISION
OCTOBER 7, 1965

AVERAGE SIZE OF CLASSES BY SUBJECT 1960-1965

TOTAL DISTRICT

	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS						SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS						
SUBJECT	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	AVERAGE 5 YEARS	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	AVERAGE 5 YEARS	COMBINED AVERAGE
AGRICULTURE	26.9	27.5	27.1	27.8	28.1	27.5	24.4	25.0	25.1	23.8	23.9	24.4	26.0
ART	29.1	28.8	28.4	29.0	29.1	28.9	25.2	25.7	26.3	26.3	26.2	25.9	27.4
BUSINESS EDUCATION	36.8	37.5	37.4	37.7	37.7	37.4	31.5	31.7	31.8	31.8	31.9	31.7	34.6
ENGLISH	31.5	30.8	30.8	31.1	31.2	31.1	29.7	29.5	29.7	30.0	29.4	29.7	30.4
FOREIGN LANGUAGE	30.7	31.9	32.2	32.1	31.9	31.8	29.1	29.7	30.4	29.4	29.2	29.6	30.7
HOMEMAKING EDUCATION	26.2	26.1	25.3	25.6	25.7	25.8	24.2	24.3	23.8	23.6	23.7	23.9	24.9
INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION	25.4	25.8	25.1	25.2	25.2	25.3	23.0	23.0	23.6	23.8	23.6	23.4	24.4
MATHEMATICS	32.3	32.2	32.3	32.5	32.6	32.4	30.5	31.0	31.4	31.2	31.0	31.0	31.7
MUSIC	38.4	38.9	39.2	39.3	40.1	39.2	34.2	35.4	36.2	36.0	36.3	35.6	37.4
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	45.3	45.0	44.9	44.1	43.3	44.5	44.1	44.7	45.0	44.9	43.8	44.5	44.5
SCIENCE	32.2	32.4	32.8	32.9	32.9	32.6	30.2	30.4	30.5	30.3	30.3	30.3	31.5
SOCIAL STUDIES	32.4	32.3	32.1	32.6	32.8	32.4	31.9	31.5	31.9	32.0	32.2	31.9	32.2
DRIVER EDUCATION	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.6	33.8	34.2	34.5	35.1	30.6	30.6
GUIDANCE (10TH GRADE)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32.0	33.9	34.4	35.0	33.8	33.8
MILITARY TRAINING	-	-	-	-	-	-	102.9	82.3	92.4	70.7	77.5	85.2	85.2
LIBRARY PRACTICE	-	22.7	26.6	21.3	26.5	24.2	-	19.7	19.4	20.4	21.2	20.2	22.2
CONTINUATION CLASS	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.[illegible]	17.6	16.5	16.1	15.6	16.2	16.2
EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED	17.1	16.7	16.7	17.6	16.3	16.9	-	15.9	16.6	16.3	16.0	16.2	16.6
ENGLISH FOR NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING	25.3	-	-	24.0	25.8	25.0	22.2	-	-	23.1	24.5	23.3	24.2
SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT	12.7	-	13.7	13.4	12.4	13.1	12.8	-	12.2	11.7	11.9	12.2	12.7
DRIVER TRAINING - CAR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
DRIVER TRAINING - TRAILER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.0	12.0	11.8	12.6	12.1	12.1
TOTAL	32.6	32.5	32.4	32.5	32.6	32.5	30.6	31.0	31.3	31.1	31.0	31.0	31.8
SCHOOL SERVICE	27.3	16.0	29.1	30.9	32.4	27.1	29.6	31.6	27.9	33.2	36.1	31.7	29.4
STUDY HALL	-	-	-	-	-	-	66.3	63.5	60.3	53.0	52.3	59.1	59.1
WORK EXPERIENCE EDUCATION	-	-	-	-	-	-	49.1	49.7	49.9	53.0	61.8	52.7	52.7
GRAND TOTAL	32.6	32.3	32.4	32.5	32.6	32.5	30.6	31.4	31.8	31.3	31.3	31.3	31.9

BUDG DIVISION
OCTOBER 7, 1965

AVERAGE SIZE OF CLASSES BY SUBJECT 1960-1965

BY DESIGNATED AREAS

SUBJECT	TOTAL DISTRICT COMBINED AVERAGE	PRIVILEGED AREA			AVALON DISTRICT			BOYLE HEIGHTS DIST.			EAST L.A. DISTRICT			WATTS DISTRICT		
		J.H.	S.H.	COMB. AV.	J.H.	S.H.	COMB. AV.	J.H.	S.H.	COMB. AV.	J.H.	S.H.	COMB. AV.	J.H.	S.H.	COMB. AV.
AGRICULTURE	26.0	24.9	22.7	23.8	-	20.5	20.5	27.1	-	27.1	27.2	-	27.2	28.9	-	28.9
ART	27.4	30.8	26.2	28.5	26.2	24.5	25.4	27.6	25.6	26.6	29.8	27.1	28.5	28.0	25.0	26.5
BUSINESS EDUCATION	34.6	39.6	32.5	36.1	37.5	31.9	34.7	36.5	31.5	34.0	33.4	32.1	32.8	34.8	29.7	32.3
ENGLISH	30.4	32.4	30.9	31.7	29.2	27.5	28.4	28.6	26.5	27.6	28.4	30.4	29.4	29.0	27.4	28.2
FOREIGN LANGUAGE	30.7	32.3	29.4	30.9	28.7	28.6	28.7	30.9	27.6	29.3	27.6	27.3	27.5	30.4	26.6	28.5
HOMEMAKING EDUCATION	24.9	26.3	21.4	23.9	26.9	22.4	24.7	25.4	23.4	24.4	25.5	28.1	26.8	27.4	21.8	24.6
INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION	24.4	25.1	22.6	23.9	25.3	23.2	24.3	25.3	24.1	24.7	26.1	24.8	25.5	27.0	22.2	24.6
MATHEMATICS	31.7	33.5	32.4	33.0	30.1	30.3	30.2	30.4	29.0	29.7	29.5	30.0	29.8	30.8	28.5	29.7
MUSIC	37.4	44.1	33.2	38.7	40.2	35.6	37.9	34.7	25.8	30.3	31.6	30.5	31.1	41.0	29.3	35.2
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	44.5	50.6	43.1	46.9	43.8	44.0	43.9	44.0	41.4	42.7	42.8	46.7	44.8	45.0	40.8	42.9
SCIENCE	31.5	33.6	30.4	32.0	29.9	30.0	30.0	30.2	28.9	29.6	29.8	29.9	29.9	30.3	30.1	30.2
SOCIAL STUDIES	32.2	33.3	32.4	32.9	30.2	30.6	30.4	30.1	29.5	29.8	29.9	32.5	31.2	30.6	31.0	30.8
DRIVER EDUCATION	30.6	-	34.8	34.8	-	29.4	29.4	-	27.4	27.4	-	32.9	32.9	-	30.4	30.4
GUIDANCE (10TH GRADE)	33.8	-	36.0	36.0	-	32.5	32.5	-	30.9	30.9	-	34.1	34.1	-	33.5	33.5
MILITARY TRAINING	85.2	-	60.1	60.1	-	248.8	248.8	-	94.1	94.1	-	101.7	101.7	-	124.0	124.0
LIBRARY PRACTICE	22.2	25.0	18.9	22.0	20.3	24.5	22.4	31.3	24.6	28.0	27.7	-	27.7	24.7	-	24.7
CONTINUATION CLASS	16.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
EMR	16.6	14.6	15.2	14.9	17.7	17.4	17.6	17.2	17.1	17.2	17.4	17.2	17.3	17.9	17.7	17.8
ENG. NON-ENG. SPKG.	24.2	-	17.6	17.6	-	-	-	26.0	24.6	25.3	23.7	20.7	22.2	-	-	-
SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT	12.7	10.1	11.7	10.9	19.3	-	19.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.1	-	13.1
DRIVER TRAINING- CAR	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DRIVER TRAIN.-TRAILER	12.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	31.8	34.3	31.7	33.0	31.3	30.0	30.7	30.5	29.1	29.8	30.1	31.6	30.9	31.5	29.5	30.5
SCHOOL SERVICE	29.4	28.8	101.8	65.3	31.3	20.4	25.9	37.6	42.6	40.1	28.8	20.3	24.6	24.0	43.0	33.5
STUDY HALL	59.1	-	48.5	48.5	-	50.3	50.3	-	25.9	25.9	-	41.8	41.8	31.4	48.5	40.0
WORK EXPERIENCE EDUC.	52.7	-	44.3	44.3	-	10.4	10.4	-	52.5	52.5	-	18.6	18.6	-	23.7	23.7
GRAND TOTAL	31.9	34.2	32.1	33.2	31.3	30.1	30.7	30.5	29.2	29.9	30.0	31.7	30.9	31.4	29.5	30.5

BUDGET DIVISION
OCTOBER 7, 1965

TRANSIENCY RATES FOR LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS BY DESIGNATED AREAS 1959-1964 JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, AND COMBINED

TOTAL DISTRICT

(EXCLUSIVE OF SIX YEAR HIGH SCHOOLS)

	SUMMER TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	SCHOOL YEAR TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	TOTAL TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	ENTRANTS	TOTAL TRANSFERS, ENTRANTS, AND DROPOUTS	ENROLLMENT	% TRANSFERS, ENTRANTS, & DROPOUTS OF ENROLL.
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS							
1959-60	7,097	19,553	26,650	25,650	52,300	101,180	51.7
1960-61	8,803	20,270	29,073	26,096	55,169	111,493	49.5
1961-62	10,947	20,670	31,617	28,288	59,905	116,568	51.4
1962-63	11,059	22,466	33,525	31,021	64,546	121,767	53.0
1963-64	11,076	21,468	32,544	32,368	64,912	124,313	52.2
TOTAL	48,982	104,427	153,409	143,423	296,832	575,321	51.6
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	9,796	20,885	30,682	28,684	59,366	115,064	51.6
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS							
1959-60	6,4[illegible]	18,075	24,513	16,327	40,840	81,508	50.1
1960-61	7,039	17,790	24,829	15,395	40,224	81,525	49.3
1961-62	7,904	17,837	25,741	17,481	43,222	85,922	50.3
1962-63	8,243	19,192	27,435	20,448	47,883	95,002	50.4
1963-64	8,876	21,715	30,591	25,013	55,604	105,076	52.9
TOTAL	38,500	94,609	133,109	94,664	227,773	449,033	50.7
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	7,700	18,922	26,622	18,933	45,555	89,807	50.7
COMBINED TOTAL	87,482	199,036	286,518	238,087	524,605	1,024,354	51.2
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	17,496	39,807	57,304	47,617	104,921	204,871	51.2

TRANSIENCY RATES FOR LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS BY DESIGNATED AREAS 1959-1964 JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, AND COMBINED

TRANSIENCY RATES PRIVILEGED AREA

	SUMMER TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	SCHOOL YEAR TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	TOTAL TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	ENTRANTS	TOTAL TRANSFERS, ENTRANTS, AND DROPOUTS	ENROLLMENT	% TRANSFERS, ENTRANTS, & DROPOUTS OF ENROLL.
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS							
1959-60	218	313	531	580	1,111	3,322	33.4
1960-61	219	263	482	427	909	3,473	26.2
1961-62	255	233	488	611	1,099	3,558	30.9
1962-63	284	261	545	671	1,216	3,681	33.0
1963-64	238	255	493	701	1,194	3,789	31.5
TOTAL	1,214	1,325	2,539	2,990	5,529	17,823	31.0
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	243	265	508	598	1,106	3,565	31.0
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS							
1959-60	269	554	823	542	1,365	3,585	38.1
1960-61	186	543	729	600	1,329	3,690	36.0
1961-62	109	441	550	229	779	2,833	27.5
1962-63	265	578	843	380	1,223	4,418	27.7
1963-64	211	638	849	603	1,452	4,842	30.0
TOTAL	1,040	2,754	3,794	2,354	6,148	19,368	31.7
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	208	551	759	471	1,229	3,873	31.7
COMBINED TOTAL	2,254	4,079	6,333	5,344	11,677	37,191	31.4
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	451	816	1,267	1,069	2,335	7,438	31.4

TRANSIENCY RATES FOR LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS BY DESIGNATED AREAS 1959-1964 JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, AND COMBINED

TRANSIENCY RATES AVALON DISTRICT

	SUMMER TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	SCHOOL YEAR TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	TOTAL TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	ENTRANTS	TOTAL TRANSFERS ENTRANTS, AND DROPOUTS	ENROLLMENT	% TRANSFERS, ENTRANTS, & DROPOUTS OF ENROLL.
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS							
1959-60	196	468	664	518	1,182	1,654	71.5
1960-61	126	478	624	526	1,150	2,000	57.5
1961-62	299	567	866	516	1,382	2,307	59.9
1962-63	348	657	1,005	516	1,521	2,300	66.1
1963-64	284	708	992	796	1,788	2,246	79.6
TOTAL	1,253	2,878	4,151	2,872	7,023	10,507	66.8
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	251	576	830	575	1,405	2,101	66.8
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS							
1959-60	585	1,566	2,155	1,521	3,676	4,489	81.9
1960-61	739	1,560	2,299	1,542	3,841	4,346	88.4
1961-62	544	1,382	1,926	1,561	3,487	4,245	82.1
1962-63	417	1,519	1,936	2,388	3,824	4,751	80.5
1963-64	363	1,658	2,021	1,904	3,925	5,222	75.1
TOTAL	2,648	7,685	10,337	8,916	18,753	23,053	81.3
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	529	1,537	2,067	1,783	3,750	4,611	81.3
COMBINED TOTAL	3,901	10,563	14,488	11,788	25,776	33,560	76.8
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	780	2,113	2,897	2,358	5,155	6,712	76.8

BUDGET DIVISION
OCTOBER 7, 1965

TRANSIENCY RATES FOR LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS BY DESIGNATED AREAS 1959-1964 JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, AND COMBINED

TRANSIENCY RATES BOYLE HEIGHTS DISTRICT

	SUMMER TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	SCHOOL YEAR TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	TOTAL TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	ENTRANTS	TOTAL TRANSFERS ENTRANTS, AND DROPOUTS	ENROLLMENT	% TRANSFERS, ENTRANTS, & DROPOUTS OF ENROLL.
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS							
1959-60	380	1,483	1,863	1,490	3,353	4,446	75.4
1960-61	375	1,337	1,712	1,436	3,148	4,626	68.0
1961-62	580	1,240	1,820	1,451	3,271	5,022	65.1
1962-63	530	1,190	1,720	1,501	3,221	5,233	61.5
1963-64	487	1,112	1,599	1,642	3,241	5,350	60.6
TOTAL	2,352	6,362	8,714	7,520	16,234	24,677	65.8
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	471	1,273	1,743	1,504	3,247	4,935	65.8
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS							
1959-60	398	1,435	1,833	1,190	3,023	4,204	71.9
1960-61	381	1,276	1,657	1,131	2,788	4,105	67.9
1961-62	463	1,262	1,725	1,265	2,990	4,534	65.9
1962-63	544	1,296	1,840	1,407	3,247	4,830	67.2
1963-64	425	1,272	1,697	1,448	3,145	5,102	61.6
TOTAL	2,211	6,541	8,752	6,441	15,193	22,775	66.7
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	442	1,308	1,750	1,288	3,038	4,555	66.7
COMBINED TOTAL	4,563	12,903	17,466	13,961	31,427	47,452	66.2
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	913	2,581	3,493	2,792	6,285	9,490	66.2

TRANSIENCY RATES FOR LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS BY DESIGNATED AREAS
1959-1964 JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, AND COMBINED

TRANSIENCY RATES EAST LOS ANGELES DISTRICT

	SUMMER TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	SCHOOL YEAR TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	TOTAL TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	ENTRANTS	TOTAL TRANSFERS ENTRANTS, AND DROPOUTS	ENROLLMENT	% TRANSFERS, ENTRANTS, & DROPOUTS OF ENROLL.
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS							
1959-60	254	824	1,078	907	1,985	2,837	69.9
1960-61	289	842	1,131	952	2,082	3,121	66.7
1961-62	274	856	1,130	971	2,101	3,347	62.7
1962-63	284	906	1,190	997	2,187	3,449	63.4
1963-64	281	622	903	1,056	1,959	3,696	53.0
TOTAL	1,382	4,050	5,432	4,883	10,314	16,450	62.7
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	276	810	1,086	977	2,062	3,290	62.7
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS							
1959-60	219	506	725	402	1,127	2,323	48.5
1960-61	205	617	822	381	1,203	2,264	53.1
1961-62	280	573	853	351	1,204	2,232	53.9
1962-63	238	590	828	458	1,286	2,547	50.5
1963-64	245	699	944	894	1,838	2,973	61.8
TOTAL	1,187	2,985	4,172	2,486	6,658	12,339	54.0
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	238	597	835	497	1,332	2,468	54.0
COMBINED TOTAL	2,569	7,035	9,604	7,369	16,972	28,789	58.9
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	514	1,407	1,921	1,474	3,394	5,758	58.9

TRANSIENCY RATES FOR LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS BY DESIGNATED AREAS 1959-1964 JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, AND COMBINED

TRANSIENCY RATES WATTS DISTRICT

	SUMMER TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	SCHOOL YEAR TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	TOTAL TRANSFERS AND DROPOUTS	ENTRANTS	TOTAL TRANSFERS ENTRANTS, AND DROPOUTS	ENROLLMENT	% TRANSFERS, ENTRANTS, & DROPOUTS OF ENROLL.
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS							
1959-60	332	960	1,292	1,091	2,383	4,038	59.0
1960-61	392	1,190	1,582	1,329	2,911	4,482	64.9
1961-62	530	1,143	1,673	1,353	3,026	4,953	61.1
1962-63	528	1,205	1,733	1,516	3,249	4,925	66.0
1963-64	458	908	1,366	1,402	2,768	4,496	61.6
TOTAL	2,240	5,406	7,646	6,691	14,337	22,894	62.6
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	448	1,081	1,529	1,338	2,867	4,579	62.6
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS							
1959-60	172	484	656	365	1,021	1,196	85.4
1960-61	132	515	647	363	1,010	1,278	79.0
1961-62	125	514	639	399	1,038	1,356	76.5
1962-63	128	496	624	482	1,106	1,536	72.0
1963-64	314	555	869	546	1,415	1,746	81.0
TOTAL	871	2,564	3,435	2,155	5,590	7,112	78.6
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	174	513	687	431	1,118	1,422	78.6
COMBINED TOTAL	3,111	7,970	11,081	8,846	19,927	30,006	66.4
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	622	1,594	2,216	1,769	3,985	6,001	66.4

BUDGET DIVISION
OCTOBER 7, 1965

DROPOUT RATES FOR LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS BY DESIGNATED AREAS 1959-1964

	TOTAL DISTRICT (EXCLUSIVE OF SIX YEAR HIGH SCHOOLS)			PRIVILEGED AREA			AVALON DISTRICT		
	DROPOUTS	ENROLLMENT	% DROPOUTS OF ENROLL.	DROPOUTS	ENROLLMENT	% DROPOUTS OF ENROLL.	DROPOUTS	ENROLLMENT	% DROPOUTS OF ENROLL.
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS									
1959-60	1,067	101,180	1.1	9	3,322	.3	44	1,654	2.7
1960-61	893	111,493	.8	9	3,473	.3	17	2,000	.9
1961-62	817	116,568	.7	1	3,558	.03	56	2,307	2.4
1962-63	724	121,767	.6	6	3,681	.2	32	2,300	1.4
1963-64	848	124,313	.7	8	3,789	.2	29	2,246	1.3
TOTAL	4,349	575,321	.8	33	17,823	.2	178	10,507	1.7
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	870	115,064	.8	7	3,565	.2	35	2,101	1.7
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS									
1959-60	8,564	81,508	10.5	197	3,585	5.5	905	4,489	20.2
1960-61	9,027	81,525	11.1	217	3,690	5.9	1,052	4,346	24.2
1961-62	8,406	85,922	9.8	224	2,833	7.9	770	4,245	18.1
1962-63	8,771	95,002	9.2	200	4,418	4.5	762	4,751	16.0
1963-64	10,456	105,076	10.0	319	4,842	6.6	980	5,222	18.8
TOTAL	45,224	449,033	10.1	1,157	19,368	6.0	4,469	23,053	19.4
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	9,045	89,807	10.1	231	3,873	6.0	894	4,611	19.4
COMBINED TOTAL	49,573	1,024,354	4.8	1,190	37,191	3.2	4,647	33,560	13.8
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	9,915	204,871	4.8	238	7,438	3.2	929	6,712	13.8

BUDGET DIVISION
OCTOBER 7, 1965

DROPOUT RATES FOR LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS BY DESIGNATED AREAS 1959-1964

	BOYLE HEIGHTS DISTRICT			EAST LOS ANGELES DISTRICT			WATTS DISTRICT		
	DROPOUTS	ENROLLMENT	% DROPOUTS OF ENROLL.	DROPOUTS	ENROLLMENT	% DROPOUTS OF ENROLL.	DROPOUTS	ENROLLMENT	% DROPOUTS OF ENROLL.
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS									
1959-60	64	4,446	1.4	46	2,837	1.6	88	4,038	2.2
1960-61	31	4,626	.7	25	3,121	.8	101	4,482	2.3
1961-62	43	5,022	.9	23	3,347	.7	91	4,953	1.8
1962-63	51	5,233	1.0	30	3,449	.9	56	4,925	1.1
1963-64	52	5,350	1.0	18	3,696	.5	54	4,496	1.2
TOTAL	241	24,677	1.0	142	16,450	.9	390	22,894	1.7
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	48	4,935	1.0	28	3,290	.9	78	4,579	1.7
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS									
1959-60	721	4,204	17.2	410	2,323	17.6	299	1,196	25.0
1960-61	678	4,105	16.5	454	2,264	20.1	302	1,278	23.6
1961-62	605	4,534	13.3	439	2,232	19.7	241	1,356	17.8
1962-63	634	4,830	13.1	447	2,547	17.6	246	1,536	16.0
1963-64	497	5,102	9.7	463	2,973	15.6	389	1,746	22.3
TOTAL	3,135	22,775	13.8	2,213	12,339	17.9	1,477	7,112	20.8
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	627	4,555	13.8	443	2,468	17.9	295	1,422	20.8
COMBINED TOTAL	3,376	47,452	7.1	2,355	28,789	8.2	1,867	30,006	6.2
AVERAGE 5 YEARS	675	9,490	7.1	471	5,758	8.2	373	6,001	6.2

COMPUTATION OF STUDENT TURNOVER BY DESIGNATED AREAS 1964-65

	E_1	E_2	E_3	TOTAL E_1, E_2, E_3	E_4	LTR TO OTHER SCH.	L	TOTAL LTR'S + L'S	COL. 15	PER CENT OF TURNOVER
PRIVILEGED AREA	609	112	204	925	414	236	782	1,018	81,857 $\frac{2357}{\frac{81,857}{10}} \times 100$	= 28.79
AVALON DISTRICT	713	204	174	1,091	2,314	1,893	557	2,450	97,789 $\frac{5855}{\frac{97,789}{10}} \times 100$	= 59.87
BOYLE HEIGHTS DISTRICT	1,341	125	366	1,832	2,229	1,652	1,445	3,097	138,431 $\frac{7158}{\frac{138,431}{10}} \times 100$	= 51.71
EAST LOS ANGELES DISTRICT	1,299	102	447	1,848	2,310	1,347	1,544	2,891	140,189 $\frac{7049.}{\frac{140,189}{10}} \times 100$	= 50.28
WATTS DISTRICT	1,293	287	797	2,377	3,363	2,462	1,626	4,088	183,365 $\frac{9828}{\frac{183,365}{10}} \times 100$	= 53.60

FORMULA: TOTAL E_1, E_2, E_3 + E_4 + TOTAL L + LTR x 100 DIVIDED BY TOTAL OF $\frac{\text{COL. 15}}{10}$ = PER CENT OF TURNOVER.

ENROLLMENT AND WITHDRAWAL

DEFINITION OF ENROLLMENT SYMBOLS

WHEN A PUPIL ENTERS A SCHOOL, PLACE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING SYMBOLS IN THE SPACE REPRESENTING THE FIRST DAY OF ATTENDANCE. SEE NUMBER 5 BELOW FOR TRANSFERS BETWEEN ROOMS IN A SCHOOL.

IN ITEMS 1-5, INCLUSIVE, OF THE FOLLOWING DEFINITIONS, "THIS YEAR" REFERS TO THE ACADEMIC SCHOOL YEAR (FROM SEPTEMBER TO JUNE) AND EXCLUDES [illegible] IN SUMMER SCHOOLS. "E_1," "E_2," OR "E_3" INDICATES THE FIRST ENROLLMENT OF A PUPIL IN THE LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS THIS YEAR. A PUPIL MAY HAVE BUT ONE [illegible] THREE SYMBOLS IN THIS DISTRICT DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR. ANY SUBSEQUENT ENROLLMENT IN ANOTHER SCHOOL OR ROOM WITHIN THIS DISTRICT WILL BE IDENTIFIED BY THE USE OF EITHER "E_4" OR "R" AS DEFINED BELOW.

BUDGET DIVISION
OCTOBER 7, 1965

DEFINITION OF ENROLLMENT SYMBOLS (CONT'D)

1. "E_1"-- IDENTIFIES AND ESTABLISHES ENTERING DATE FOR PUPIL ENROLLING FOR THE FIRST TIME IN ANY PUBLIC SCHOOL IN THE UNITED STATES THIS YEAR.

2. "E_2"— IDENTIFIES AND ESTABLISHES ENTERING DATE FOR PUPIL ENROLLING FOR THE FIRST TIME IN ANY CALIFORNIA PUBLIC SCHOOL THIS YEAR BUT WHO HAS BEEN ENROLLED IN A PUBLIC SCHOOL OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA THIS YEAR.

3. "E_3"— IDENTIFIES AND ESTABLISHES DATE FOR PUPIL ENTERING BY TRANSFER FROM ANOTHER CALIFORNIA PUBLIC SCHOOL NOT IN THIS DISTRICT THIS YEAR.

4. "E_4"-- IDENTIFIES AND ESTABLISHES DATE FOR PUPIL ENTERING BY TRANSFER FROM ONE SCHOOL TO ANOTHER WITHIN THIS DISTRICT THIS YEAR. THIS DEFINITION INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING:
   - A. PUPIL ENTERING BY TRANSFER FROM ANOTHER PUBLIC SCHOOL WITHIN THIS SCHOOL DISTRICT THIS YEAR.
   - B. PUPIL RE-ENTERING THIS SCHOOL DISTRICT BUT NOT TO THE SAME SCHOOL THIS YEAR AFTER WHAT SEEMED TO BE PERMANENT WITHDRAWAL.

5. "R" -- A. IDENTIFIES AND ESTABLISHES THE DATE OF RETURN OF A PUPIL WHO LEAVES A SCHOOL IN THIS SCHOOL DISTRICT AND RETURNS TO THE SAME SCHOOL WITH OR WITHOUT INTERVENING ENROLLMENT IN ANY OTHER SCHOOL DURING THE SAME YEAR. (NOTE: THE NAME OF THE "R" PUPIL RETURNING TO THE SAME REGISTER IN THE SAME SCHOOL MONTH SHOULD BE RE-ENTERED AS A NEW NAME ON THE MONTHLY ATTENDANCE RECORD PAGE.)
   - B. IDENTIFIES PUPILS WHO TRANSFER FROM ONE ROOM TO ANOTHER WITHIN THE SAME SCHOOL, WHICH INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING. (NOTE: THE "R" IS TO BE ENTERED ON THE DAY FOLLOWING "LTR" DATE ON OTHER REGISTER.)
     - 1) PUPIL ENTERING FROM ANOTHER ROOM IN THE SAME SCHOOL THIS YEAR.
     - 2) PUPIL TRANSFERRED FROM ONE REGISTER TO ANOTHER THE SECOND SEMESTER, I.E. KGN. TO B1, ETC. (DOESN'T APPLY TO PUPIL REMAINING ON SAME REGISTER AT MID-TERM.)

DEFINITION OF WITHDRAWAL SYMBOLS

WHEN A PUPIL LEAVES A CLASS, PLACE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING SYMBOLS IN THE SPACE REPRESENTING THE LAST DAY OF MEMBERSHIP. THE LAST DAY OF MEMBERSHIP IS THE DAY ON WHICH PERMANENT WITHDRAWAL IS DETERMINED.

1. RECORD AS "L": PUPILS WHO LEAVE THE LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.
2. RECORD AS "LTR": PUPILS WHO ARE TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER SCHOOL IN THE LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT OR TO ANOTHER ROOM WITHIN THE SAME SCHOOL.

Maintenance of School Plants

In order to maintain school buildings at identical levels of repairs, the Maintenance Branch has operated on District-wide programs for specified large cost types of repair. The following programs are of an ongoing nature and they apply to all schools on the time basis indicated.

A. Repainting of Buildings

1. Exterior - 5 year frequency with 2-1/2 year touch up.
2. Interior - 12-1/2 year frequency with sanitary facilities and touch up on basis of need.

B. Lockers - Exterior and Gymnasium

Repainting - 5 year frequency.

C. Chalkboard Refinishing

Repainting - 6 year frequency.

D. Yard Line Painting

Yard playground lines are painted annually.

E. Draperies - Assembly and Auditorium Replacement

1. Elementary schools - 8 to 10 year frequency - determination based on need.
2. Secondary schools - 12 to 15 year frequency - determination based on need.

F. Typewriter Repair

Cleaning and overhaul - 2 year frequency

G. Asphalt Surfaces

Reseal - 6 to 7 year frequency

H. Locker - Lock Replacement

Replace - 15 year frequency

I. Building Lock Replacement

Replace old bit-key locks - In second year of 6 year program.

Maintenance of School Plants (Continued)

J. Boiler Replacement

Replace all boilers installed prior to 1926 with gas fueled type and automatic controls - approximately one-half completed on four year program.

K. Furniture Refinishing

1. Elementary schools - 10 year frequency
2. Secondary schools - 12 year frequency

Equipment Rehabilitation Schedule in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

District	Schools Rehabilitated or Constructed 1954-59		Schools Rehabilitated or Constructed 1954-59		Total No. of Schools
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	
Boyle Heights	7	30%	16	70%	23
Avalon	6	50%	6	50%	12
East Los Angeles	4	23%	13	77%	17
Watts	7	35%	13	65%	20
Privileged Study Area	6	37%	10	63%	16

Average Number of Acres Per Site in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

Poverty Areas	Elementary	High School
Avalon	4.1	15.0
Boyle Heights	3.6	11.5
East Los Angeles	3.9	13.3
Watts	5.5	18.2
Economically Privileged Area		
West Los Angeles	5.1	22.3
District-Wide Area	7.0	19.5

Total Valuation of Equipment as of June 30, 1965 in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

Poverty Areas	No. of Schools	Valuation of Equipment
Avalon	12	$ 1,975,788.
Boyle Heights	23	2,565,670.
East Los Angeles	17	1,928,214.
Watts	20	2,268,975.
Economically Privileged Area		
West Los Angeles	16	2,065,951.

Assembly Facilities in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

All schools in the areas listed have assembly facilities except Soto Street School in the Boyle Heights area. Soto Street School is one of the smaller schools in the area with 419 pupils, and has been declining in enrollment in recent years.

These assembly facilities may be either Auditorium Buildings, Multipurpose Buildings or Partitioned Rooms.

	Average Capacity	
Poverty Areas	Elementary	High School
Avalon	328	1,025
Boyle Heights	279	1,079
East Los Angeles	254	1,200
Watts	314	900
Economically Privileged Area		
West Los Angeles	298	1,303

Capital Outlay for Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

Capital outlay included in this summary sheet are from the Controller's records and are listed as follows:

1960 Bond program expenditures
1963 Bond program expenditures to March 31, 1965
The total assets on record as of June 30, 1965, for land, buildings, ground improvements and equipment.

The supporting data tabulates these assets for each school.

Poverty Areas	No. of Schools	No. of Pupils	Total 1960 Bond Expend.	1963 Bond Exp. to 3/31/65	Total Fixed Assets (Land, Bldg., Grds., & Equip.)
Avalon	12	17,050	$3,122,078.	$1,501,633.	$20,940,707.
Boyle Heights	23	24,670	3,210,808.	2,741,138.	28,064,674.
East Los Angeles	17	20,965	5,214,585.	758,320.	22,844,276.
Watts	20	24,079	7,649,979.	396,956.	29,900,029.
Economically Privileged Area					
West Los Angeles	16	17,395	805,533.	21,379.	23,786,066.

Transportation of Pupils

Pupil transportation is provided under Board of Education Rules and Regulations and these are published in the Los Angeles City School Districts' Administrative Guide. They apply to all elementary and secondary pupils in the School District and the pertinent sections are listed as follows:

Board Rules

Board Rule 2376. Pupils Eligible for Transportation Boundary Limits. In general, the boundary limits beyond which pupils receive transportation shall be two and 1/4 miles from an elementary school, two and 3/4 miles for a junior high school, and three and 1/4 miles for a senior high school.

In establishing such boundaries, distance shall be measured by the most direct route over regularly traveled roads or highways, but consideration shall be given to natural geographical boundaries, hazards, community problems, etc.

Board Rule 2377. Exceptions to Pupil Transportation Limits. The Superintendent shall review requests and grant exceptions to the established transportation limits when, in his opinion, unusual hazards and circumstances justify this action.

Exceptions to the general policies concerning pupil transportation limits shall be reviewed annually by the Superintendent to determine if the original need still exists.

An annual report shall be made to the Transportation Committee listing the exceptions, the distance from the schools involved, hazards involved, and the recommendations of the Superintendent regarding the continuance of the transportation services in these cases.

Administrative Regulations

2377-1. All requests for exceptions to the basic mileage limits for transportation shall be routed to the Superintendent through the office of the Associate Superintendent of the appropriate operating division, and upon the approval of the Superintendent such requests shall be presented to the staff committee (See 2377-2 and 2377-3) for investigation.

After consideration of the investigation report, the Associate Superintendent shall submit his recommendations to the Superintendent.

2377-2. The Associate Superintendent of the Division of Secondary Education and the Division of Elementary Education shall establish permanent committees of at least five (5) persons to investigate requests for exceptions to the basic mileage limits.

Transportation of Pupils (Continued)

2377-3. The Supervisor of the Safety and Driver Instruction Section shall serve as chairman of the permanent transportation committees for both the Divisions of Elementary and Secondary Education.

2377-4. In the investigation of each request for an exception to the basic mileage limits on the basis of hazard, the committee shall be guided by the following criteria:

a. Limited Walking Space Combined With Traffic Volume. Total traffic volume on other than mountainous roads exceeds one hundred twenty (120) vehicles per hour while children are en route to or from school and one or more of the following exists:

1. Less than 3.5 feet of walking space outside of a curbed roadway on at least one side of the roadway, or
2. A two lane road of thirty (30) feet or less, or a four lane road of fifty (50) feet or less in width with less than ten (10) feet of road shoulder (paved or unpaved) on at least one side, (a sliding scale of shoulder width and street width to be used) or
3. A two lane road of thirty (30) feet or more, or a four lane road of fifty (50) feet or more in width, with less than five feet of road shoulder (paved or unpaved) on at least one side of the road.

b. Obstructed Walkways. Walkways, (shoulder, paths or sidewalks) on roads with a volume of one hundred twenty (120) vehicles per hour, are obstructed continuously for seventy-five (75) feet or more, or if obstructed for less than seventy-five (75) feet there is less than one space gap per minute between vehicles traveling on the near side of the center line.

c. Mountainous Roads. When mountainous road conditions impair the safe driving sight distance on two lane roads of less than thirty (30) feet in width when little or no off-street walking space is available (shoulder or path) and the traffic volume exceeds sixty (60) vehicles per hour.

d. Impaired Sight Distance. The traffic volume exceeds one hundred eighty (180) vehicles per hour through the crosswalk at an uncontrolled intersection where the safe driving sight distance is impaired and the crossing exceeds forty (40) feet in width. (Speed is computed in figuring safe driving sight distance.)

Transportation of Pupils (Continued)

e. Prolonged Obstructions. When due to construction or weather, the only safe route to school is made unusable or impassable for a period in excess of one week.

2377-5. In the event transportation is approved under any of the foregoing exceptions, such transportation will be discontinued immediately upon the improvement of the conditions for which transportation has been provided.

Board Rule 2378. Pupils eligible for transportation without regard to boundary limits are:

a. Pupils whose condition of health as certified by a school physician makes transportation advisable, providing such pupils reside near a regular school bus route or a public carrier line serving their particular school.

b. Pupils attending schools or classes for the physically handicapped.

c. Deaf and crippled pupils, three years of age or older, attending special schools or classes established for such types of pupils. (Exception to the minimum First Grade Requirements.)

d. Pupils assigned by the Elementary Education Division, the Education of Exceptional Children Section or by the Child Welfare and Attendance Branch to special training schools or classes, social adjustment classes, or other schools or classes for exceptional children, who are physically or mentally handicapped or who live beyond the transportation boundary.

Board Rule 2379. Pupils Ineligible to Receive Transportation. Pupils not classified in Rule 2378, pupils below the First Grade except as provided in Rule 2378 "c"; pupils of pre-compulsory age (6 to 8 Years) assigned to special classes for other than deaf and crippled pupils; pupils twenty-one years of age, post graduate pupils of senior high schools, junior college pupils, and pupils attending adult classes shall not be eligible for home-to-school transportation.

Report on School Lunch Program

1. Basic Policy - Financial

School cafeterias shall be operated on a self-sustaining basis.

2. Prices and Portions

The prices and portions for all food are Board-approved and apply equally to all food sold.

The elementary pupil meal is a tray lunch sold for 35¢, all other food is sold a la carte.

3. Standard Recipes

All food regularly served in school cafeterias is prepared in accordance with standard recipes which are the same through the District.

4. Manpower Formulas

Manpower formulas are applied equally throughout the District.

All elementary cafeterias operated on the simplified program use an adjustment to the formula applied equally to all simplified operations.

5. Construction of Cafeterias - Elementary

With the exception of an experimental Food Service Unit at two schools, no funds have been available for construction of cafeterias since the expenditure of the 1958 bond funds.

6. Secondary

All regular secondary schools have operating cafeterias.

7. Schools Without Operating Cafeterias

There are 118 elementary schools without operating cafeterias.

There are 26 of these schools listed in the four "poverty areas" that do not have operating cafeterias.

Los Angeles Secondary School Libraries

Each regular secondary school has a library with a staff composed of one certified librarian and some clerical help. The book collection, geared to pupil needs and supporting the curriculum, is selected by the librarian with the aid of teachers, administrators, and the Library Section Evaluation and Order Department. Each school in the city has the same unit appropriation based on enrollment.

Library Statistics for Poverty Area Schools

Junior High Schools

Poverty Areas	Volumes	Enrollment	Books per Pupil
Avalon District			
Carver Jr. H.S. - SCOPE	9,365	2,189	4.2
Boyle Heights District			
Hollenbeck Jr. H.S. - SCOPE	11,836	2,322	5.1
*Nightingale Jr. H.S. - SOC	6,434	1,261	5.1
Stevenson Jr. H.S. - SOC	10,601	1,780	5.9
East Los Angeles District			
Belvedere Jr. H.S. - SCOPE	9,157	2,023	5.0
Griffith Jr. H.S. - SOC	9,419	1,811	5.0
Watts District			
*Gompers Jr. H.S.	9,924	2,337	4.3
Markham - SCOPE	9,116	2,094	4.4
Economically Privileged Area			
A School Emerson Jr. H.S.	10,446	1,734	6.0
B School Revere Jr. H.S.	9,938	2,330	4.3
District as a Whole	650,963	127,326	5.1

---

*Adjacent to poverty area

Los Angeles Secondary School Libraries (Continued)

Senior High Schools

Poverty Areas	Volumes	Enrollment	Books per Pupil
Avalon District			
Jefferson H.S. - SOC	10,669	1,847	6.0
*Manual Arts H.S. - SCOPE	17,600	3,541	5.0
Boyle Heights District			
Lincoln H.S. - SCOPE	15,712	2,800	6.0
Roosevelt H.S. - SOC	15,759	2,650	6.0
East Los Angeles District			
Garfield H.S. - SOC	12,917	3,106	4.0
Watts District			
Jordan H.S. - SCOPE	8,129	1,672	4.8
Economically Privileged Area			
A School Palisades H.S.	8,921	2,089	4.3
B School University H.S.	13,729	2,951	4.6
District as a Whole	498,894	121,301	4.1
GRAND TOTAL	1,149,857	248,626	4.6

---

*Adjacent to poverty area

Los Angeles Elementary School Libraries

Library Statistics for Poverty Area Schools

Poverty Area - Avalon District

Schools	Type of Library	Enrollment	Books in Library	Books per Child
Ascot Avenue	A	1,073	2,675	2.49
*Forty-Ninth Street	None	1,105	*1,275	....
Holmes Avenue	None	713	....	....
Hooper Avenue	A	1,599	2,226	1.39
Main Street	A	1,309	1,687	1.2+
Nevin Avenue	A	706	3,363	4.6+
Trinity Street	A	990	1,800	1.81
**Wadsworth Avenue	A	1,162	1,700	1.46
West Vernon	None	868	...	...

---

*This school has no library at this time. It has 1,275 books which will become part of their library collection when the library is installed in the future.

**This school's book collection will be installed during the first semester of the 1965-1966 school year.

Los Angeles Elementary School Libraries (Continued)

Poverty Area - Boyle Heights District

Schools	Type of Library	Enrollment	Books in Library	Books per Child
Albion Street	A	498	1,704	3.42
Breed Street	None	524	...	...
Bridge Street	A	512	2,064	4.03
Dacotah Street	A	764	2,056	3.68
Euclid Avenue	None	999	...	...
**Evergreen Avenue	A	1,110	1,700	1.53
First Street	A	842	1,710	2.03
Gates Street	A	895	1,933	2.15
Glen Alta School	None	388	...	...
Griffin Avenue	A	409	1,845	4.51
Hillside School	None	418	...	...
Huntington Drive	A	611	1,703	2.78
Latona Avenue	None	416	...	...
Lorena Street	A	1,085	2,400	2.21
Malabar Street	A	1,363	3,493	2.56
Murchison Street	A	1,353	3,223	2.53
Sheridan Street	None	1,348	...	...
Soto Street	None	406	...	...

**This school's book collection will be installed during the first semester of the 1965-1966 school year.

Los Angeles Elementary School Libraries (Continued)

Poverty Area - East Los Angeles District

Schools	Type of Library	Enrollment	Books in Library	Books per Child
Belvedere School	A	1,119	2,065	1.84
Brooklyn Avenue	A	797	3,516	4.41
City Terrace School	A	902	1,805	2.00
Eastman Avenue	A	1,581	3,629	2.21
Ford Boulevard	A	1,294	1,925	1.48
Fourth Street	None	1,030	...	...
Hammel Street	A	1,311	1,971	1.57
Harrison Street	A	1,229	3,329	2.70
Humphreys Avenue	A	1,119	2,182	1.94
Lane, Robert H., School	A	332	1,809	5.44
Marianna Avenue	A	597	1,759	2.81
McDonnell Avenue	None	236	...	...
Riggin Avenue	A	913	2,093	2.29
Rowan Avenue	A	1,438	4,190	2.91

Poverty Area - Watts District

Schools	Type of Library	Enrollment	Books in Library	Books per Child
Avalon Gardens	A	426	2,147	5.0
Compton Avenue	A	789	2,346	2.9
Grape Street	A	1,214	3,382	2.7
Ninety-Second Street	A	1,335	3,285	2.4
Ninety-Third Street	A	1,459	2,037	1.3
Ninety-Sixth Street	A	1,053	3,395	3.2
Ninety-Ninth Street	A	973	1,842	1.8

Los Angeles Elementary School Libraries (Continued)

Poverty Area - Watts District (Continued)

Schools	Type of Library	Enrollment	Books in Library	Books per Child
One Hundred Second	A	1,496	2,251	1.5
One Hundred Seventh	A	1,534	2,136	1.3
One Hundred Ninth	None	802	...	...
One Hundred Eleventh	A	1,271	3,500	2.7
One Hundred Twelfth	A	1,074	2,390	2.2
One Hundred Sixteenth	A	774	1,793	2.3
One Hundred Eighteenth	A	1,143	2,295	2.0
One Hundred Twenty-Second	A	1,066	2,005	1.8
Ritter School	A	592	2,037	3.4
Weigand Avenue	A	859	3,098	3.6

Economically Privileged Area

Schools	Type of Library	Enrollment	Books in Library	Books per Child
Bellagio	A	741	2,027	2.74
Brentwood	A	1,160	2,169	1.87
Brockton	A	570	2,008	3.52
Canyon	A	458	1,821	3.98
Fairburn	B	493	1,905	3.97
Kenter	A	514	1,933	3.76
Marquez	A	956	1,902	1.98
Nora Sterry	A	667	2,050	3.07
Pacific Palisades	B	770	1,074	1.39
Roscomare	A	464	1,617	3.48
Warner	A	725	3,596	4.96
Westwood	B	582	1,170	2.01

Audio-Visual Services in Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

	Major Services			Other Services		
Areas	(1963-1965) Number of teachers using A-V materials other than film	(1964-65) Number of films delivered to schools	(1964-65) School journeys	(1964-65 Consultant Service Visits to Schools	(1964-65) Technical Service Visits to Schools	(1964-65) Evaluation Committee Members
Avalon (12 schools)	376/ 31*	5,770/ 480*	211/ 17.5*	7	9	1
Boyle Heights (23 schools)	579/ 25*	9,570/ 416*	347/ 15.1*	15	12	4
East Los Angeles (17 schools)	522/ 30*	7,260/ 427*	288/ 16.9*	10	10	7
Watts (20 schools)	597/ 30*	9,160/ 458*	370/ 18.5*	10	9	3
Four Poverty Area Totals (72 schools)	2,074/ 28*	31,760/ 445*	1,216/ 17.0*	42/ /.579*	40	15
Privileged (16 schools)	344/ 21.5*	7,000/ 437*	154/ 9.0*	10/ .627*	4	5
Whole District (560 schools)	21,286/ 36*	229,058/ 388*	6,698/ 11.3*	286/ .517*	301	85

(*Average per School)

Textbook Section
Division of Instructional Services

TABLE I

September 30, 1965

ALLOCATION OF TEXTBOOK EXPENDITURES, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, 1964-65

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
School	Enrollment 1964-65	Standard Textbook Allocation	Lost and Damaged Textbook Collections	Total of Columns 2 and 3	Value of Emergency Requisition	Value of "Special Programs of Educ." Materials, plus Experimental Spanish Program	Amount Spent for Rebinding Textbooks*	Total Textbook Expenditure Cols. 2-7	Average Expenditure Per Pupil
Group A (Educationally Deprived)									
Belvedere	2,109	$13,807.66	$ 175.21	$13,982.87	$ 121.86	$ 86.95	$ None	$14,191.68	$ 6.73
Carver	2,312	13,139.75	620.62	13,760.37	116.84	966.75	None	14,843.96	6.42
Gompers	2,406	14,461.25	216.95	14,678.20	18.40	86.95	1,357.39	16,140.94	6.71
Griffith	1,826	10,917.00	424.00	11,341.00	347.63	5,366.52	1,016.18	18,071.33	9.90
Hollenbeck	2,437	15,034.59	169.42	15,204.01	171.30	269.65	1,840.15	17,485.11	7.17
Markham	2,299	14,639.74	663.96	15,303.70	None	779.95	844.75	16,928.40	7.36
Nightingale	1,306	7,235.52	232.85	7,468.37	74.52	1,944.22	2,877.26	12,364.37	9.47
Stevenson	1,829	10,700.23	200.71	10,900.94	173.61	1,838.72	1,154.75	14,068.02	7.69
					Average expenditure per pupil, above 8 schools:				7.68
Group B (Educationally Privileged)									
Emerson	1,667	$10,140.55	$ 555.54	$10,696.09	$ 397.68	None	$ 147.51	$11,241.28	$ 6.74
Revere	2,209	12,444.94	1,304.90	13,749.84	None	None	795.66	14,545.50	6.58
					Average expenditure per pupil, above 2 schools:				6.66

Average District Expenditures

In the school district as a whole, the standard textbook allocation for 1965-66 is the same in every school: $5.07 for grades 7 and 8 and $6.76 for grades 9 through 12. When the "variables" of new enrollees, lost book collection, emergency requisitions, Special Programs of Education, experimental programs, and rebinding are included, the junior high school "Average Expenditure Per Pupil" (Column 9 above) is established at $7.08.

---

*Schools may send as many active textbooks to be rebound as they wish. There is no specific allocation per school, inasmuch as costs of rebinding are charged to a separate account.

Textbook Section
Division of Instructional Services

TABLE II

September 30, 1965

ALLOCATION OF TEXTBOOK EXPENDITURES, SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, 1964-65

School	1 Enrollment 1964-65	2 Standard Textbook Allocation	3 Lost and Damaged Textbook Collections	4 Total of Columns 2 and 3	5 Value of Emergency Requisition	6 Value of "Special Programs of Educ." Materials, plus Experimental Spanish Program	7 Amount Spent for Rebinding Textbooks*	8 Total Textbook Expenditure Cols. 2-7	9 Average Expenditure Per Pupil
Group A (Educationally Deprived)									
Garfield	3,327	$28,178.68	$1,876.75	$30,055.43	$ 894.14	$ 2,505.38	$ 1,341.00	$34,795.95	$ 10.46
Jefferson	2,131	15,760.78	1,057.20	16,817.98	1,948.89	1,576.21	1,266.50	21,609.58	10.14
Jordan	1,936	15,911.82	329.87	16,241.69	2,536.92	369.58	2,982.99	22,131.18	11.43
Lincoln	2,736	18,885.53	1,573.90	20,459.43	675.51	707.61	405.28	22,247.83	8.13
Manual Arts	3,536	27,733.99	3,834.93	31,568.92	1,410.58	354.52	2,375.06	35,709.08	10.10
Roosevelt	2,620	19,542.12	2,562.49	22,104.61	734.63	2,138.16	90.89	25,068.29	9.57
					Average expenditure per pupil, above 6 schools:				9.96
Group B (Educationally Privileged)									
Palisades	2,011	$14,879.75	$1,110.91	$15,990.66	$ 306.53	$ 717.53	$ 336.74	$17,351.46	8.63
University	2,928	18,890.16	4,736.42	23,626.58	1,781.77	2,705.00	2,498.73	30,612.08	10.45
					Average expenditure per pupil, above 2 schools:				9.54

Average District Expenditures

In the school district as a whole, the standard textbook allocation for 1965-66 is the same in every school: $5.07 for grades 7 and 8 and $6.76 for grades 9 through 12. When the "variables" of new enrollees, lost book collection, emergency requisitions, Special Programs of Education, experimental programs, summer school, and rebinding are included, the senior high school "Average Expenditure Per Pupil" (Column 9 above) is established at $9.37.

*Schools may send as many active textbooks to be rebound as they wish. There is no specific allocation per school, inasmuch as costs of rebinding are charge[illegible] a separate account.

Special Programs of Education in Secondary Schools of Comparison Areas of Los Angeles

Area	Basic Reading			Reading Improvement			Power Reading			Low Index *		Educable Mentally Retarded **		Non-Eng. Speak. *		Gifted *		Academ. Enr. *	
	Tchrs	Cl.	Enr.	Tchrs	Cl.	Enr.	Tchrs	Cl.	Enr.	Pds.	PPE	Pds.	Enr.	Cl.	PPE	Pds.	PE	Pds.	PPE
Avalon																			
Jr. Hi.	2	5	107	1	1	26	-	-	-	70	1634	9	51	-	-	-	-	10	262
Sr. Hi.	9	18	267	7	14	227	-	-	-	114	3166	18	100	-	-	-	-	37	868
Boyle Heights																			
Jr. Hi.	8	9	135	10	21	321	2	2	33	140	3370	24	137	31	770	-	-	24	771
Sr. Hi.	7	18	321	5	14	304	1	1	11	79	1971	12	71	61	1396	-	-	47	1386
East Los Angeles																			
Jr. Hi.	8	19	404	4	4	98	1	1	19	89	2179	12	71	25	608	-	-	24	808
Sr. Hi.	8	5	154	8	5	131	1	1	30	34	793	6	32	20	409	-	-	12	360
Watts																			
Jr. Hi.	6	14	245	4	5	99	-	-	-	161	4107	18	106	-	-	-	-	1	35
Sr. Hi.	3	7	144	2	3	68	1	1	12	34	977	9	54	-	-	-	-	13	389
Privileged																			
Jr. Hi.	-	-	-	1	1	19	2	2	33	-	-	3	16	-	-	30	975	67	2180
Sr. Hi.	1	2	54	2	3	84	2	3	81	9	226	3	18	13	205	25	709	7	220

* Pupil period enrollment

** Core class equals three (3) periods

Distribution of Questionnaires

Avalon District

Elementary

Ascot Avenue
Forty-Ninth Street
Holmes Avenue
Hooper Avenue
Main Street
Nevin Avenue
Trinity Street
Wadsworth
West Vernon

Junior High

Carver

Senior High

Jefferson
*Manual Arts

Boyle Heights District

Elementary

Albion Street
Bridge Street
Euclid Avenue
First Street
Glen Alta School
Hillside School
Latona Avenue
Malabar Street
Sheridan Street

Junior High

Hollenbeck
*Nightingale
Stevenson

Senior High

Lincoln
Roosevelt

East Los Angeles District

Elementary

Belvedere
City Terrace
Ford Boulevard
Hammel Street
Humphreys Avenue
Marianna Avenue
Riggins Avenue

Junior High

Belvedere
Griffith

Senior High

Garfield

*Schools adjacent to poverty areas.

Distribution of Questionnaires (Continued)

Watts District

Elementary	Junior High
Avalon Gardens	Gompers
Grape Street	Markham
Ninety-Second Street	
Ninety-Third Street	**Senior High**
One Hundred Second	
One Hundred Eleventh	Jordan
One Hundred Sixteenth	
One Hundred Twenty-Second	
Weigand Avenue	

Palisades, Brentwood, Westwood Area (Privileged)

Elementary	Junior High
Bellagio	Emerson
Brentwood	Revere
Brockton	
Canyon	**Senior High**
Fairburn	
Kenter	Palisades
Marquez	University
Nora Sterry	
Palisades	
Roscomare	
Warner	
Westwood	

Willowbrook	-	Elementary	-	5 schools
Enterprise	-	Elementary	-	4 schools
Compton City	-	Elementary	-	16 schools
Compton Union High School			-	6 schools

Teacher and Administrator

Questionnaire Returns by Comparison Area**

Area	Number of teachers & administrators assigned to area	Number of questionnaires returned		Percent of return of teacher questionnaire
Watts				
Elementary		226		
Secondary		250		
Special		85		
Total teacher	599		561	93 plus %
Administration	27	25		
Boyle Heights				
Elementary		129		
Secondary		393		
Special		80		
Total teacher	717		602	84%
Administration	28	25		
Avalon				
Elementary		276		
Secondary		284		
Special		91		
Total teacher	692		651	94%
Pacific Palisades				
Elementary		225		
Secondary		338		
Special		39		
Total teacher	612		602	98 plus %
Administration	26	24		
East Los Angeles				
Elementary		226		
Secondary		300		
Special		94		
Total teacher	656		620	94 plus %
Administration	26	19		
Compton				
Elementary		665		
Secondary		361		
Special		110		
Total teacher	*		1136	*
Administration	*	58		

* Figures not available in time

** Figures revised on basis of computer tally, summer 1966.

Summary of Los Angeles School Districts Programs For the Educationally Disadvantaged

(Prepared by the Office of Urban Affairs)

Elementary

Educable Mentally Retarded Classes

A core program for educable mentally retarded pupils taught by specially credentialed teachers is provided within a regular school program. Class limits in the primary grades are 12-15 children; in the middle and upper grades from 15-18 children.

Compensatory Education

Concentrated during the regular school day, this program provides assignment of additional teachers to schools with large numbers of educationally disadvantaged youngsters. Efforts to strengthen educational programs consist of reduction of class size at the primary level, providing a variety of remedial services deemed appropriate for that particular school, or teaching of English to non-English speaking pupils.

Divided Primary Day

An organizational provision allows for staggered daily attendance of primary pupils for the purpose of giving more intensive individualized reading instruction than is possible in the normal type of organization. A portion of the class commences school and is dismissed at an earlier hour than the remainder of the class which permits a smaller number of pupils with the teacher during reading periods.

Extended Day School

Programs provide supplemental assistance after regular school hours at the elementary school level to children from disadvantaged areas whose needs for remedial assistance in their school work is evident. Extra teaching help is provided to improve opportunities for academic success through emphasis on remedial reading, reading improvement, arithmetic improvement, language arts improvement, library utilization, individualized tutoring and help with homework concepts, improvement of student leadership potential, and specialized student club activities.

Remedial Reading

Special reading programs are designed to improve the reading achievement of pupils who have need of additional assistance beyond the regular basic reading program. The assignment of a special teacher with reduced class size offers greater potential for intensive individual reading instruction.

Los Angeles Report (Continued)

Social Adjustment

Classes provide special placement for pupils with behavioral problems who also take an undue proportion of instructional time in the regular classroom. The assignment of a special teacher with reduced class size offers potential for students to gain insight into their learning or adjustment difficulties and opportunity to give both individualized academic help and special guidance to these pupils.

Pre-School Classes

These classes provide an attack upon the problems of social and educational deprivation at their very roots in order to help ready environmentally disadvantaged youngsters to compete successfully with their contemporaries as they start and progress through the school cycle. Motivation and experiences both social and academic are designed to prepare children in their early formative years for success in a school situation.

The Reception Room

This project is designed to provide "team" assistance to the individual disadvantaged child whose first contacts with the Los Angeles City Schools are unaccompanied by achievement, health, attendance, test or other informative data which permit accurate, initial class placement. The program design includes an involvement of the parent to promote understanding and cooperation which will aid in making successful the child's experience in a new class setting.

A specialized team, coordinated by the counselor, gathers essential information so that appropriate remedial, instructional, and/or enrichment procedures may be instituted as indicated and recommendation for placement of the environmentally disadvantaged child be based upon relevant data.

Staff at two elementary schools, for an average of 20 children per month in each of three rooms, provides orientation, diagnosis of educational and physical needs, and "team" class placement recommendations. One school serves primary age children, the other school serves pupils eligible for placement in grades 1-3, 4-6.

Saturday School

Programs provide specialized instructional assistance in concentrated form for children referred by staff of the regular school. Teaching aid stresses individual assistance in remedial reading, arithmetic improvement, language arts, use of library, and homework concepts. School libraries, special interest activity programs, and playgrounds at the Saturday School are also maintained for enrichment of and use by children.

Los Angeles Report (Continued)

Secondary

Basic Reading

Corrective reading instruction is provided for apparent slow learners other than Educable Mentally Retarded who have reading problems. The program includes diagnosis of reading problems and a sequential development of fundamental skills; phonetic analysis and other methods of work recognition, vocabulary development and comprehension of central thought, of significant details of sequence of events and of cause and effect relationships. Appropriate multi-level materials are used and instruction proceeds at a pace suited to the capacities of the pupils to improve ability and increase interest in reading.

Reading Improvement

Corrective reading instruction is provided for pupils of average or above average ability who are reading considerably below expectancy. The program includes diagnosis of pupil reading problems and a sequential development of fundamental skills; phonics and other methods of work recognition; vocabulary building through speaking, listening, reading, and writing; phrase reading; comprehension of central thought and significant details, and of cause and effect relationships; and obtaining exact meaning from the printed page in study and general reading. Appropriate multi-level materials are used. A pace suited to the capacities of pupils is maintained in order to increase their ability and interest in reading. Improves study skills.

Power Reading

The program is planned for pupils of above average ability who are reading at or above their grade level and who wish to improve their skills of comprehension and critical thinking. It is intended to be both voluntary and selective. A highly individual series of learning experiences are provided which are based on analysis of student needs and abilities, and draw its materials from various content areas--social studies, science, mathematics--as well as from literature. The program aims to develop higher power of comprehension, recall, interpretation, perception, and appreciation. It increases vocabulary and emphasizes study skills, and depth, efficiency, and discrimination in reading. Flexibility is developed and reading rate adjusted to the material and purpose of reading. The interest and power to plan a self-improvement program for continued growth in reading at mature levels is promoted.

The Special Training Program

Special sections of content field areas are provided for apparent slow learners who require more individualized assistance in their educational program.

Los Angeles Report (Continued)

Program for Educable Mentally Retarded (E.M.R.)

A core program for educable mentally retarded pupils is taught by specially credentialed teachers within the regular school program.

Social Adjustment

Classes provide special placement for pupils with behavioral problems who also take an undue proportion of instructional time in the regular classroom. The assignment of a special teacher with reduced class size offers potential for students to gain insight into their learning or adjustment difficulties and opportunity to give both individualized academic help and special guidance to these pupils.

Program for Non-English Speaking and Foreign Students (N.E.S. AND F.S.)

Special programs are provided in designated schools for pupils whose ability to speak, read and write the English language is not adequate for participation in a regular school program. Such classes are organized into beginning, intermediate, and advanced groups.

Advanced Placement Classes

Advanced Placement classes are college level courses in academic subjects taught on the high school campus by qualified high school teachers. Students receive high school graduation credit for satisfactory completion of the course and by successful achievement in the Advanced Placement examinations may also receive college credit and/or advanced placement in college.

High School - U.C.L.A. Program

Selected 12th grade students may attend a limited number of college classes at the University of California at Los Angeles for which college credit only is earned.

High School - Junior College Program

Selected 12th grade students may attend a limited number of junior college classes for which high school graduation credit or college credit may be received.

High School - U.S.C. Resident Honors Program

Selected 12th grade students may attend the university during their senior year. While in residence such students complete their high school graduation requirements and also participate in special honors classes provided by the university.

Los Angeles Report (Continued)

The School Community Opportunity Project in Education

This program consists of four special services provided students and parents in selected schools. These services include the corrective reading program, an extended library day, evening counseling and school-community liaison experimental program under the McAteer Act provisions.

Student Achievement Center

The Center provides specialized resources and a "reading centered" approach to help disadvantaged youngsters get the assistance needed to achieve school success. Program design includes a communications skills room emphasizing basic reading skills, remedial social studies and remedial mathematics rooms to provide help for pupils at each of the six secondary grade levels. Additionally, a Student Achievement Center counselor works with academically able as well as disadvantaged students, and a School Community Coordinator improves communications with parents of disadvantaged children and with community groups.

Group Counseling

This program is designed to provide intensive group and multiple professional counseling services to selected secondary students who are potential dropouts. Group counseling techniques are directed toward instilling in students such specific values as worthwhile participation in the life of the community as a responsible adult, achievement of socially responsible behavior, working harmoniously with others toward a common purpose, and the recognition that upward social mobility depends upon successful achievement and social skills.

Vocational Education Program

The High School Vocational Education Program is conducted in 41 different schools. The following indicate the number of classes in specific training areas:

Technical Drafting	26	Graphic Arts	27
Architectural DRafting	14	Heavy Metal	12
Auto Mechanics	32	Light Metal	3
Electronics	18	General Metal	11
Woodworking	28	Upholstery	2

Advisory committees are being established or have been set up for each of these major training areas. While the Vocational Education funds which have been made available to the Secondary Division have resulted in an expansion of the occupational program offered, it should be noted that the Industrial Occupational classes have been established in our secondary schools for five years. Records of student placements on jobs over this period of time indicate that those who have been trained in the above classes are successful in finding jobs.

Los Angeles Report (Continued)

In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps

The project is designed to enable youth to break out of poverty by providing them with suitable work training experiences and services. Objectives are to provide modest earnings that will make it financially possible for disadvantaged youth to remain in school; to provide opportunities for the acquisition of useful work skills and experience; to develop positive attitudes toward work, sound work habits, and ability to work with other people; to develop higher aspirations for their future in line with their maximum potential.

1,443 students recruited from 45 senior high schools (1,135 of these are from senior high schools in disadvantaged areas) are project participants. Assignments to work categories include:

Child care Trainee	62	Library Aide Trainee	100
Custodian Trainee	132	Office Worker Trainee	449
Food Service Trainee	141	Playground Assistant Trainee	78
Garage Attendant Trainee	11	Stock Clerk Trainee	30
Gardener Trainee	73	Teacher Aide Trainee	367

with work stations located at 45 senior high schools, 27 junior high schools, 225 elementary schools, 40 child care centers, 2 Board garages, Stores Branch warehouse, and 13 administrative offices. Approximately 450 certificated staff personnel are involved in the identification, screening, assignment and evaluation of in-school youth trainees. Direction and guidance is provided trainees on a one-to-one basis in most locations.

Parent-Child Pre-school Classes

These classes provide an educational program for mothers and their pre-school age children in the same classroom to help the former develop attitudes and skills which will enable them to guide, respond to, and motivate the child. Class goals include increasing school readiness on the part of the child, strengthening parental understanding of child growth and development, and improving the pre-school child's cognitive skills and group relationships.

Gerontology Classes

Classes meet in easily accessible locations and are directed specifically to increase the self-competency and community participation of the older adults. Class goals are to improve the self-image of the aging adult, increase his knowledge and use of available community resources, develop knowledge and constructive practice in areas of physical and mental health, and increase his participation in the life of the community.

Los Angeles Report (Continued)

Guidance, Counseling and Testing

This program for adults involves the assistance of trained counselors to help individuals who do not meet new and changing vocational standards to place their experiences, abilities, and skills in proper context to the realities around them. Project objectives involve helping the individual to establish goals and future plans, meet personal and social problems, and develop interests and abilities to help him become a better citizen and contributor to society; increased articulation of the adult school service with community agencies is a major focus.

Home Management Classes

Classes are held in an apartment setting for homemakers in low socio-economic areas, especially younger homemakers, with the goals of developing skills and techniques in housekeeping activities, improving buying power within a limited income, advancing standards of health and appearance, and building increased positive awareness of the homemaker's role.

In addition to these programs, the School District operates a number of special summer programs. Among these are the following:

Head Start

An eight week orientation to school is provided at 60 elementary locations for children from economically disadvantaged areas enrolling for the first time in September in a Los Angeles City public school in either kindergarten or first grade. The project provides a blending of health, social, and educational services through class activities involving cooperative work, play, and language communication. Large muscle outdoor activities, nutrition, rest, field trips, and indoor programs provide the change of pace required by the age and attention span of the children.

Summer Study Center

Eight different programs carried on at each of 24 school sites provide remedial help in academic areas, individualized tutoring, assistance in maintaining fundamental skills, provision for a stimulating work environment, and a variety of enrichment opportunities. The programs that operate from one school site include (1) reading clinic, (2) language clinic, (3) reading, language, and arithmetic improvement classes, (4) field trip laboratory, (5) science center laboratory, (6) instrumental music workshops, (7) library, and (8) art workshops.

Pre-Internship Student Teacher Training

Designed to determine those most qualified for internship assignments to disadvantaged areas, the program provides student teachers with directed teaching experience which will furnish a more complete understanding of

Los Angeles Report (Continued)

the sociological background of the disadvantaged child and the specific training to meet the educational needs of such children. A student gains supervised pre-internship teaching experience through an assignment to provide instruction at a Summer Study Center and attends thrice-weekly scheduled university seminars to discuss the slum child, recent research relative to the environmentally disadvantaged, and the development of curriculum materials.

Secondary

Group Counseling

The program combines enrollment in a summer class of choice or need with intensive group and individual counseling, as required, for referred summer school pupils who have been identified as potential dropouts. Five junior high schools (offering ninth grade reading) and five senior high schools (offering standard summer programs) in designated poverty areas are each assigned a counselor experienced in individual and group counseling techniques who provides full-time counseling services, including the enlistment of adjunctive parental and community cooperation.

Summer Opportunity Center

A program of enrichment opportunities through voluntary pupil enrollment for a complete range of ability levels is offered in ten schools (not designated as summer schools) within poverty areas. In accordance with available classroom facilities which are appropriate to the age and experience of the student, ten broad areas of enrichment opportunity include (1) art, (2) music, (3) mathematics exploration, (4) communication skills, (5) social science, (6) agriculture, (7) industrial arts, (8) physical skills, (9) domestic skills, and (10) science. Field trips pertinent to classroom activities and integrated with classroom instruction are provided as are full day library opportunities in each school. A school-community coordinator at each site serves to help realize mutual home, school and community objectives.

Neighborhood Youth Corps

The project is designed to provide in-school disadvantaged youth with an extended opportunity to gain additional paid trainee work experience during the summer vacation in schools, branches, administrative and other offices. Through purposeful activities a school link is maintained throughout the summer which should help assure a return to classes in the fall. Additionally, young people are aided to meet current expenses for essentials which should ease the financial load of their parents. Trainee garage attendant, gardener, library aid, office worker, playground assistant, stock clerk, and teacher aid.

Los Angeles Report (Continued)

Adult

Summer School Program Extension

Extends the limited summer school offerings to a regular program and thereby helps environmentally disadvantaged and other adults maintain an educational continuity, increases the preparation time essential for the development of employment skills, and speeds readiness for employment. Participating adult schools provide instructional, guidance, administrative and clerical services for all of the regular English for foreign speaking, citizenship, elementary, high school, business education, and pre-employment training classes.

Adult Counseling and Guidance

Designed to continue in the disadvantaged areas the counseling impact upon adults who need individual assistance to help develop interests and abilities, establish goals and future plans, meet personal and social problems, and help each become a better citizen and worker, comprehensive counseling and guidance services in the areas of academic education, vocational retraining, vocational competencies, and occupational information are provided for students who are chronically displaced workers, low productive workers, dropouts, and those with a variety of problems that hinder their employability.

Parent-Child Pre-School Program

An educational program in which mothers and their pre-school children participate simultaneously in the same classroom is designed to develop attitudes and skills which will enable parents in impoverished areas to guide, respond to, and motivate their children as the youngsters are about to enter the "school world." Programs and materials are developed appropriate to the particular group, and sufficiently flexible for adaptation as the group composition changes. Where language barriers are present, instruction in English is part of the program within the context of understanding the child, the family, and the community.

Gerontology

The program is designed to enhance the constructive approach to community living of the older adult and to increase his self-competency and civic participation. Classes, in locations accessible to public transportation, include the areas of self-growth and self-understanding, community leadership training, rehabilitation, and training in new ways of contributing to family living.

Home Management

Training and motivation is provided for homemakers in the low socioeconomic areas to increase their awareness of the importance of the mother's

Los Angeles Report (Continued)

role in the family and in the community. Homemaking education opportunities are provided to homemakers, especially younger homemakers, to develop skills and techniques in housekeeping activities, to show increase in buying power of limited income, to display improvement in existing housing accommodations, and to improve significantly standards of health, well-being, and appearance. Classroom equipment and supplies are of a kind within the attainment possibilities and environmental understanding of the participants.

English Classes for Foreign Speaking Adult Professionals

Such classes use the strengths and unique learning experiences of professionally trained adults to attack the problem of the non-English speaking adult who is functionally illiterate in our cultural environment and who lives in a poverty area. Curriculum is so developed that instruction to help gain proficiency in oral and written English communication skills is related to the needs of the non-English speaking professional and skilled worker. A major program objective is to eliminate the impairment in the ability of non-English speaking adults to get or retain employment commensurate with their real ability.

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM

This summary is excerpted from material published May 15, 1964, by the New York City public schools.

Summary

Pupils and Curriculum

1. Integration will be a major factor in the choice of schools for the More Effective Schools Program.
2. The program will provide for education beginning at ages 3-4.
3. The school will be open from 8 a.m. - 6 p.m. with programs to meet the needs of the pupils.
4. Class size will vary from 15 in pre-kindergarten classes to a maximum of 22 in other grades.
5. Classes will include children with a wide range of abilities and personality traits, heterogeneously grouped. Individualized instruction in the 3 R's will be provided for thorough flexible grouping.
6. Promising modern teaching methods will be implemented under optimum conditions. These will include team teaching, and non-graded blocs consisting of early childhood grades, grades 3-4 and 5-6.
7. Abundant supplies of modern teaching materials appropriate to urban communities will be necessary.
8. Provision will be made to meet the needs of children with physical, emotional, and social problems through a teacher, guidance and medical team.
9. Efforts will be made to overcome the effects of pupil and family mobility through closer cooperation with the Department of Housing, the Department of Welfare, and other social agencies. In addition, adjustments will be made in the present transfer regulations to encourage pupils to remain in their schools.
10. Close relations will be established with local colleges and universities for purposes of teacher training, curriculum development, research, and evaluation and project development.
11. Maximum use will be made of the newest techniques in audio-visual instruction including closed circuit T.V.
12. Teacher specialists in art, music, and other curriculum areas will be used to enrich the instructional program.

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM (Continued)

Personnel

1. Efforts will be made to recruit a staff which is enthusiastic, able, and committed to the program. This will be achieved through the democratic involvement of teachers and supervisors.

2. Provision will be made for a continuous program of professional growth including payment by the Board of Education for one college course per semester.

3. In order to give teachers maximum time for concentration on instruction, teachers will receive a daily unassigned preparation period, and relief from all non-teaching duties.

School Plant and Organization

1. Maximum use of the school plant will be made for a full school day, week-end and during the summer months.

2. Facilities will be sought for outside the regular school plant, in office buildings, settlement houses, etc.

3. Schools will be located so as to achieve maximum integration.

Community Relations

1. Each school will have a Community Relations Expert to promote good human relations among the children, the staff, and the community.

2. Wide and sustained community involvement will be encouraged through the parent associations, parent workshops, and community organizations.

Pupils and the Curriculum

Overview

Basic to the success of a More Effective School Program is a dynamic reshaping of the schools' organization, curriculum, and total resource into a new design that will fully meet the needs of every child. In this giant task, eight areas of action emerge as fundamental for moving children up the ladder in all aspects of growth-moral, academic, social, emotional, and physical. These include areas of action to:

1. Establish an Early Childhood Program for children, ranging from prekindergarten through the second grade.

2. Make complete provision for meeting the needs of exceptional children.

3. Redesign grades 3-6 as a Middle Grade Program.

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM (Continued)

Early Childhood Program

A basic step in designing a more effective school is the creation of a new type of Early Childhood Program that will meet children's needs so fully that remedial and special classes, as well as nonpromotion, could be reduced to a minimum.

The Early Childhood Program is envisioned as a four- or five-year sequence of prekindergarten, kindergarten, and grades 1 and 2. The keystone is the provision for prekindergarten classes.

This program attempts to deal realistically with those elements of living that make for a positive self-image. The intellectual and emotional processes that control a child's adjustment and achievement are inextricably interwoven. Moreover, it recognizes the urgency for the development of a comprehensive plan that seeks to mitigate the widespread educational, physics, social and recreational deficits among our children. Only the combined efforts of teachers, psychologists, special workers and the related professions can hope to tap the still unrevealed strengths of our children so as to nurture a far more effective self-image and thus to realize maximum growth.

The home class should be small enough and adequately supported through an appropriate ratio of teachers, teaching specialists and guidance-clinical personnel to serve a heterogeneous group of children. It should serve as the primary resource for children with a wide range of needs and abilities.

Fortunately New York City has available many resources which should be drawn into the resolution of the character of the Early Childhood Program: the largest educational staff in the world (including the Bureau of Early Childhood Education and the Bureau of Child Guidance), the Department of Welfare, college personnel and the findings of both pioneering and substantiative experiments and projects.

Prekindergarten

Registers of 15 maximum should be established for all four-year-olds. If possible, three-year-olds should be included in this program so that enrichment and guidance may be available to every child at the most receptive points in his life. An action program should be initiated to register on a voluntary basis all pupils eligible for prekindergarten classes.

In schools where the need is generally felt, the prekindergarten program should extend from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., or from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. In other schools a schedule from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m., 9 a.m. to 12 or 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. may be more suitable. Because the quality of the program will, of course, depend largely on the number of trained adults at hand and the time

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM (Continued)

they have for working both individually and collectively with the children, the following ratio of professional and auxiliary staff is recommended:

The number of teachers should be proportionate to the number of hours the children are present:

Time Schedule	No. of Pupils	No. of Teachers
9 to 3	15	3
8 to 5 or 6	15	3
9 to 3	30	4
8 to 5 or 6	30	5*

(*Based on assumption that some pupils will not be in attendance the whole day.)

The supportive personnel assigned are needed to provide basic services for the children and to provide the assistance needed by teachers in designing learning experiences appropriate to these children's needs. The supportive services include those of:

An Early Childhood Consultant to work full time with the staffs of every three schools in order that teachers may gain the insights, attitudes, and knowledges necessary in working successfully with the children.

A guidance team to work with both children and parents. The team would study each child and initiate guidance where needed. The team for each school would include teachers, a psychologist, a psychiatric consultant, social workers (for extensive work with parents), and guidance counselors who have been trained by a psychiatric social worker.

A medical-dental team (especially selected for their qualifications in working with children of preschool age) to provide a complete physical examination for each child. Correction of defects should be initiated when necessary in cooperation with a nearby hospital designated as the feeder hospital for the particular school. Medical and dental care, public or private, should be on a continuous basis. Such supplementary elements as meals should be included when necessary.

A Community Relations Expert (who may be an Auxiliary Teacher), working with School-Community Aides to develop a carefully planned program of communication with parents.

Other special assistants to help in a variety of supporting ways. These special assistants would include School-Community Aides; volunteers from junior and senior high schools; and college students and educators who might pool their time, interest, and talent in conducting helpful research and preservice activities.

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM (Continued)

Kindergarten

Kindergarten classes for all pupils are a necessary corollary of the prekindergarten offering in the EArly Childhood Program. A concerted drive should be launched in June, 1964, to register for 1964-65 every pupil of kindergarten age. It is strongly recommended that pupils in socially-disadvantaged neighborhoods attend for the full-day program (8-5, 8-6 or at least 9-3) and that the value of this program be stressed in discussions with parents. The full-day program is imperative in order to provide the necessary foundation in the listening, speaking, and vocabulary skills that the kindergartners will apply in learning to read the following year. In addition, these five-year-olds need the full school day in which to learn to relate to others, to begin to develop a richer self-image, and to overcome the negative effects of their environments. Only when the full day is patently not feasible should there be the 9-12 and 1-4 sessions as an alternative.

Registers should be limited to 18 to 20 children, each class accommodated in a separate room. Teachers should be assigned on a team basis:

Time Schedule	No. of Pupils	No. of Teachers
9 to 3	18 to 20	1-1/2*
8 to 5 or 6	18 to 20	2
9 to 3	36 to 40	3
8 to 5 or 6	36 to 40	4**

(*Two teachers for three classes
**Based on assumption that some pupils will not be in attendance the whole day.)

The personnel described as basic to the success of the prekindergarten program (consultants, guidance team, medical-dental personnel, and so on) should work simultaneously with the kindergarten staff and should continue to work with increased effort and necessary refinements in subsequent years.

In preparation for a More Effective School Program, a full-fledged drive should be made in June, 1964, to enroll in a summer kindergarten all prospective first graders who did not attend kindergarten during 1963-64. These classes may be developed in cooperation with the Bureau of Community Education and should be supported by as many of the resources previously outlined as can be developed by summer, 1964. Class registers should not exceed 20, and close liaison should be maintained between the summer kindergarten schools and the feeder schools.

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM (Continued)

Grades 1 and 2

In grades 1 and 2, which comprise the top two years of the Early Childhood Program, the same reinforcements of personnel, material, and equipment should be introduced simultaneously with their introduction in the prekindergarten and kindergarten. Thousands of first and second graders are already handicapped by lack of any kindergarten (let alone prekindergarten!) training; their need is scarcely less urgent than that of the younger children. Every possible effort must be made to stress all-around progress; and every obstacle to that progress must be ferreted out and removed as rapidly as possible.

Each school will need to develop a pattern of organization for its first and second grade. The pattern selected should facilitate rapid growth by marshalling the fullest capacity of the staff to meet the needs of the children. Alternative possible patterns are:

Class Unit - All classes on the grade should be heterogeneously organized with flexible homogeneous groups for small-group instruction and team teaching within a class.

Grade Unit - All classes on the grade heterogeneously organized with flexible homogeneous groups within the class and also within the entire grade block on a planned basis.

Nongraded Primary - All classes organized in spans, such as K-1, or 1-2, with each class a heterogeneous unit with flexible homogeneous unit with flexible homogeneous subgrouping for instruction.

In each of the three organizations, the heterogenous grouping of pupils in class groups should be carefully planned to provide for a wide range of abilities within each class. Teachers may need preparation in using the designated plan of organization, and that preparation must be provided.

The maximum class register in these first and second grades should be 22, with a reduction to 18 to 20 for classes of pupils who have had no kindergarten experience. In addition, a fourth teacher should be assigned to every three classes for teaching on a team relationship. Activities of this fourth teacher would include such responsibilities as:

Teaching skills to small groups or individuals and team teaching within the home classroom.

Continuing instructions in creative work (art, music, etc., initiated by a specialist.

Testing pupils and diagnosing results.

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM (Continued)

Providing remedial assistance to absentees, new entrants, and other pupils in need of individual help.

Teaching the majority of a class while its regular teacher works with a few pupils.

Assisting with guidance situations.

Teaching the class during the homeroom teacher's unassigned period.

Special Placement

At the end of the second grade, placement of each child should involve consideration not only of the child's academic achievement but also of his social, emotional, and physical maturation. In light of individual needs, special placement may be arranged.

Acceleration. Pupils achieving at or about grade 4 academic level and possessing physical and social maturity may be accelerated to grade 4.

Junior Guidance. Pupils evidencing marked inadequacy in achievement or adjustment because of emotional or social instability may be placed in regular Junior Guidance classes with a maximum register of 8 to 12 pupils a class.

Bridge Class. Pupils who lag in achievement (perhaps because of excessive mobility or other factors that prevented sustained attention to studies) but who show sufficient capacity to succeed in the third grade (if placed in a small group and given much individual help) may be placed in a "bridge class" with a register of 15 or fewer pupils. In general, the pupil should be retained in the class for the full school year; in some cases, however, the child may be returned to a regular class during the year upon the recommendation of the team consisting of teachers, supervisors, clinician, and counselor.

Retention. Pupils showing lack of ability to progress adequately and exhibiting social immaturity may, upon the recommendation of the team consisting of teachers, counselor, supervisor, and clinician, be retained for another year within the Early Childhood Program.

Referral. Pupils exhibiting marked slowness may be referred to a psychologist for possible CRMD placement.

In all cases of special placement, the parent of the child concerned should be involved in and understand the reasons for the decision.

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM (Continued)

The Early Childhood Program, in brief, is conceived as a determined effort to give every child, especially those in socially-disadvantaged areas, a better "running start" on his school career by (a) welcoming into pre-kindergarten classes all the four-year-olds and as many three-year-olds as can be recruited and accommodated, (b) drawing into kindergarten classes all the five-year-olds, and (c) supporting not only the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten classes but also the first and second grade classes with a powerful staff that is equal to every need.

Middle Grade Program

Just as there is need for restructuring and reconceiving the pattern of EArly Childhood Education, so is there need for redesigning the organization, class size, and other factors affecting progress in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Four types of organization are suggested for the Middle Grade Program; the one selected is to be adequate for the particular school and staff:

Class Unit. All classes on a grade may be heterogeneously organized, with flexible homogeneous groups for small group instruction and team teaching within the class.

Grade Unit. All classes on the grade heterogeneously organized, with flexible homogeneous groups within the class and also on a planned basis within the entire grade bloc.

Nongraded Units. Each class is a heterogeneous group spanning two grades such as 3-4, 4-5, and 5-6, with flexible homogeneous grouping for skill teaching, talent groups, and the like.

Team Teaching. All classes on a grade are considered a team. Later, after adequate development of the staff, two or even three grades should comprise a team. Flexible homogeneous grouping is used for skill teaching, utilization of special abilities of teachers, talent groups, etc.

Middle Grade classes should be organized with a maximum register of 22 pupils. The teaching staff should consist of four teachers for every three classes on a grade level for use on a team basis. The duties of the fourth teacher should be similar to those listed in the section relative to grades 1 and 2.

At the level of grades 3-6, the services of a Corrective Reading Teacher should be used to assist pupils having deep-rooted reading problems. The Corrective Reading teacher should work closely with the classroom teacher and other members of the guidance team. Unless the school has a highly mobile pupil population, the need in future years for the services of a Corrective Reading teacher should decrease as pupils' reading needs are met more effectively through smaller classes, a better foundation of pre-reading skills, a full complement of guidance services, and more effective teaching.

The special supportive elements already defined in the Early Childhood Program should be introduced simultaneously for children in the Middle Grades as well and supplementary provisions should be anticipated as additional needs of children in this group become evident.

Exceptional Children

Fundamental to any school program that seeks to meet children's needs must be recognition of the fact that the exceptional child is part of every school population and is entitled to an education tailored to fit his need. Among the exceptional children we are particularly concerned with are the emotionally and socially disturbed. For some of these children, passive as well as aggressive, special classes and provisions can be made within the school; for others who cannot be accommodated even by special programs with the school, referral must be made to sources outside the school.

No child should be allowed to continue in a class who seriously and persistently impedes its normal functioning. It is recognized that any child who minimally cannot adjust is committing an injury to himself as well as the other children. The major responsibility for all these socially and emotionally malfunctioning children should be carried by both educators and mental clinicians on a sustained basis.

Within the school. Provision should be made for the following services and special classes.

> "Closed Junior Guidance" classes should be formed to meet the needs of socially and emotionally disturbed children. The classes should be organized with a balance of passive and overt children to allow for effective functioning. Classes should be closed-end, with a register of 8-12 pupils. Three Junior Guidance Teachers should be assigned to every two classes. Full supportive guidance and other necessary services must be available.
>
> "Vestibule Junior Guidance" classes should be formed, with Junior Guidance teachers, to absorb delinquent and pre-delinquent children anytime during the school year, while proper placement of these children is being determined. A new class should be formed to accommodate a maximum register of eight as soon as a register is closed. Full supportive services must be available.

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM (Continued)

"Home Instruction" pupils should be aided by an intensified and well-coordinated program that involves regular visits by the Home Instructor, close liaison with the parent school, increased use of guidance services, pilot studies involving new audio-visual approaches, and new types of material.

Outside the school. Provisions must be made for the destructive, disruptive child who cannot function in the regular classes and for whom school resources have been exhausted.

Presuspension Hearing. Each child should be evaluated by a team composed of the teacher, principal, and guidance staff.

Medical Suspension. When suspension is justified, it shall be made immediately on the recommendation of the school clinicians assigned by the Bureau of Child Guidance to the Junior Guidance program of the school. This suspension would be for medical reasons.

Day-Care Center. Children suspended should not be left with the home or street as their major educational resource but rather should be assigned to a new type of day care center or an improved type of residential home. A drive should be initiated immediately to provide these two types of facilities in adequate number and quality to accommodate the many pupils in need of their special services. It is important that children not be suspended and then a few days later be returned to renew their disruptive activities. These children must be accommodated in a place that can serve them more effectively than their present school.

State Hospital Returnees. Clinical and counseling programs should be mandatory for as long as necessary. These programs should be designed to provide screening and placement of children before their return to schools, sustained follow-up, and close liaison with the receiving elementary school.

Special Programs and Procedures

Development of a curriculum that will meet the needs of children in socially disadvantaged areas involves two approaches: the selection and use of today's best practices, and the invention and refinement of new practices created directly to meet the urgencies of the More Effective School Program. With the cooperation of the Board of Education staff and of the area college and other resource personnel, both approaches should be used to the utmost to implement such innovations and extensions as the following:

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM (Continued)

Extended School Day. Using the finest practices derived from the All-Day Neighborhood Schools, Play Schools, settlement houses, programs of the Bureau of Community Education, and the like, a dynamic Extended School Day program should be conducted at each school.

School Library. Each school's library should contain materials not only appropriate to the needs of the children but also appropriate to the needs of the parents of these pupils. It should be accessible to adults in the evening hours.

Camp Program. Each school should sponsor some appropriate camp programs ("Sleep-Away," "All-Year-Round," "Summer," etc.) in which both pupils and parents may participate. Beginning in the summer of 1965, each school should serve as a Summer Day Camp in which there is a blending of skill and talent, excursions, physical activities, and other attractive offerings.

Summer Kindergarten. Each school should conduct during 1964 summer kindergartens for all children not enrolled in a kindergarten during 1963-64 and eligible for first grade in September, 1964. Later, this program may be expanded to include children who had less than full-time kindergarten experience the preceding school year.

Welcome Program. Each school should develop a comprehensive summer program for orienting pupils who move during the late spring and early summer to the school area from Puerto Rico, the southern states, and other places with different educational or language backgrounds.

Seven-Day Schools. Study should be made of the value and practicability of offering, in some schools, a full seven-day program of club-recreational-library activities.

Speech Teachers. The speech teacher in addition to using her time for the correction of serious defects should also focus on developing effective speech patterns for all pupils, working not only with individuals and small groups but also as a teacher for the whole class.

Materials and Equipment

The inadequacy of the standard contemporary materials and equipment, in terms of meeting the learning needs of some of the children in socially-disadvantaged areas, is attested by the failure of some of these children to achieve their maximum intellectual potential. New materials that do meet their learning needs must be developed, along with new equipment and new procedures for using them. Aggressive action should be taken on such fronts as the following:

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM (Continued)

Urban Packet. There is urgent need for a full complex of materials (texts, practice books, photographs, films, slides, transparencies, etc.) that are oriented to the urban child and that build on what he does know. These materials should reflect the life and cultural contributions of all minority groups. The need is not in a single curriculum area but across the full spectrum of curriculum areas.

Language Tests. Include in each classroom some books in each child's own language--French, Spanish, Italian, and so on--and include in each class program some provision for the child's use of these books.

Audio-Visuals. Pilot studies should be undertaken to ascertain the most effective ways for the use of audio aids, visual aids, audio-visuals, tapes, records, television, close-circuit television, etc.

Procedures. Pilot studies should be undertaken, also, in exploring diversified ways of using materials readily at hand, possibly as a function of the Campus School Program and personnel active in these schools.

Programmed Instruction. The fullest potential of the mounting flood of programmed-instruction material should be utilized in every More Effective School.

Test Schools. Consideration should be given to having each school in the More Effective School Program designated as a "test school" for classroom tryouts for the Bureau of Supplies and selected items of school equipment and instructional material.

In addition to the action just cited, priorities must be given by the Bureau of Supplies to schools in the program. A realistic procedure for inventorying school supplies and equipment should be developed. In order to make possible a school program tailored to daily needs, a drawing fund for supplies should be established at the Bureau of Supplies. A cash fund, with regular accounting procedures, should be established for the principals of these schools. Principals should be fully authorized to purchase, for exploratory and pilot use, nonlist materials.

Personnel

Staff Required for Each More Effective School:

84 Classroom Teachers - (This will include teachers for extended day programs, Junior Guidance, pre-school and kindergarten classes.)
1 Community Relations Expert (bi-lingual where necessary - may be Auxiliary Teacher.)

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM (Continued)

8 Teaching Specialists - Art, Music, Science, Corrective Reading (required only in initial stages), Library, English Language Resource (or Non-English Speaking teacher), Audio-Visual (The above teaching specialists are to work with the classroom teacher in small and large group situations as a peer teacher.)
3 Guidance Counselors
1 Psychologist
2-1/2 Social Workers
1/4 Psychiatric Consultant
1 Principal
1 Administrative Assistant (teacher assigned to supervise school aids and perform all administrative duties as designated by the principal)
5 Assistant Principals (1 Early Childhood specialist)
4 Secretaries
1/2 Doctor
1/2 Dentist
1 Nurse
School Aids (60 hours daily)
1/3 Early Childhood Consultant (as needed)

School Plant and Organization

Space Requirements

This program for a school with a pupil population of approximately 1,000 children, with a maximum class size of 22 pupils and with adequate space to house the staff and auxiliary services, will require the following:

50 full size classrooms
2 rooms for music and art programs
1 library (2 full size rooms)
7 full size rooms with movable partitions in each to provide 14 half size rooms for small group instruction, special services, etc.
7 offices for a guidance suite and the community relations staff
a medical and dental suite
a lunchroom for at least 500 pupils
an auditorium, a gymnasium and outdoor playground facilities
adequate sanitation facilities for pupils and adults
lunch and restroom facilities for adult personnel
administrative offices
provision for parking

Patterns of School Selection

Some schools are to be located in racially imbalanced areas.

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM (Continued)

Some schools are to be located in integrated areas or in areas that have potential for integration.

Some schools are to be located in presently integrated areas which are beginning to lose middle class pupils.

Some schools are to be newly organized in vacant buildings, on an unzoned basis.

Some schools are to be organized in a main building with one or more annexes located in underutilized schools, settlement houses, housing developments and such other space as may be made available for this program.

Where transportation is necessary, it should be provided by the Board of Education.

Pupil Transiency

Pupil mobility is a serious problem which affects the school as well as the academic achievement, and personal and social adjustment of the children. To reduce the number of school transfers, the Board of Education should encourage pupils to remain in the original More Effective School when they change residence, if the parents so desire.

To this end, the Board of Education should:

assume the cost of transportation

set no limit as to distance of time of travel within the city

offer this as a right rather than a privilege

give the policy extensive publicity within the More Effective Schools

refrain from consolidating classes after February 1.

When circumstances indicate that traveling a great distance is not in the best interest of the child, the principal should have the authority to secure permission from the Assistant Superintendent to review a parent's request to remain in the More Effective School.

LOS ANGELES TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
1125 West Sixth Street
Los Angeles 17, California

(COPY)

November 1, 1965

Dr. Kenneth Martyn
17041 Courtney Lane
Huntington Beach, California

Dear Dr. Martyn:

Our Association, the Los Angeles Teachers Association, the local affiliate chapter of the California Teachers Association, has held a series of meetings in regard to the expenditure of state and federal funds for educationally underprivileged children. I am enclosing for your consideration a copy of a survey that we mailed out to the teachers of Los Angeles, together with a ditto copy of the tabulated results. In general, our Association's viewpoints are expressed in the verifaxed copy entitled "Los Angeles Teachers Association Recommended Program, Elementary and Secondary Education Act."

A capsule of our viewpoints would give major emphasis to the following concept: a) Since all educational research seems to indicate that a child develops his basic educational problems in the first three years of school attendance, and b) since these problems develop at this stage as a result of cultural disadvantages accrued during the pre-school years, c) our Association would urge that a major concentration of these funds be placed in pre-school, kindergarten, and primary grade programs in whatever schools that exist with number of educationally underprivileged children.

If this is where the trouble starts, and if California schools are continuing to enroll each year larger numbers of children in these grade categories, then it would appear logical that the development of an adequate educational program at this level holds the hope of the most efficient expenditure of the school dollar in terms of educational value to be received by the children.

Our chief criticism of the presently-proposed program of the Los Angeles School District's administration is that we believe it over-provides for secondary school programs at the expense of an adequate development of a suitable program for the primary grades. Our opposition to a so-called "pilot school concept" as proposed by other groups is that it narrows the benefits to be received to too-few children.

Very truly yours,

s/Joseph M. Brooks
Executive Secretary

JMB:mcy
cc: Federal Aid Committee

Information from President AFT L.A. Chapter

After one year of operation, the More Effective Schools Program, initiated by the AFT in New York City has been expanded from ten to twenty schools. A preliminary evaluation of the program has underscored some significant results:

1. Voluntary Racial Integration - Parents of non-poverty children living on the fringes of the effective schools areas have voluntarily requested transfer of their children into these more effective schools.
2. Decrease in Pupil Absenteeism - Ninety per cent attendance improvement was noted in most of the schools under the effective schools program.
3. Increase in Teacher Morale - Fewer teacher transfer requests have been submitted and the greatest percentage of teachers in the program are permanent. A greater degree of teacher participation in the entire program has elevated the professional self-image of the teacher.
4. Marked Pupil Improvement in Language Usage - Tests and teacher observations have noted improvement in pupil language usage abilities.